LIBRARY COPY

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS
"Maitri-Bhavan"
15, Sir Krishna Rao Road,
BANGALORE-4, South India.

THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way" — however dimly, and lost among the host — as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.
—The Voice of the Silence

VOL. XXIX FEBRUARY 1958 No. 2

"THUS HAVE I HEARD"—
THE PURSUIT OF KNOWLEDGE

Each man is to himself absolutely the way, the truth, and the life....
The way and the truth come first, then follows the life.
— Light on the Path

PERCEPTION, INFERENCE AND TESTIMONY are declared by the ancient teachers to be the means of obtaining knowledge, whether fallible or infallible.

Knowledge is threefold — sense-knowledge, head-learning, Heart-Wisdom. Each one of us, now and here, possesses a triple storehouse of knowledge. We have the powers of observation and of the sensations which are ours through the use of the sense organs, offering data for one order of information. We have the power of the mind — from mere cerebration to profound thinking — which yields to us our head-learning. We have our emotions — lower passions or exalted aspirations — which manifest our Heart-life and bespeak our Heart-Wisdom.

All three are partial and faulty for all mortals. Those only who attain to true Immortality possess in perfection complete and infallible Wisdom. This is the co-ordinated, concordant and complete Wisdom. Sense-data are correctly comprehended by head-learning, which in its turn is inspired by the pure light of the Heart, which is the seat of the Great Self. Real Immortality means possessing this triple Wisdom.

Mortality implies not only death through the decay of the body but also the presence of ignorance about innumerable things in space, the motions of time and the events in history; further, the separation which personal feelings and lack of altruism make between the human heart and the grand heart of Nature, which is Compassion Absolute.

Men suffer because the body decays, the mind continues to be ignorant

and the heart remains selfish. Death is feared; ignorance is found difficult to overcome; selfishness is considered a natural inheritance of every man, woman and child. And so from death to death mortals pass, knowing only sorrow at which they tap their foreheads and say, "*Kismet.*"

But the innate divinity at the very core of our being whispers—"There must be a way out of the death of the body, the darkness of ignorance, the corruption of selfishness." We do not seek the Way to Wisdom—we lose ourselves in our busy-ness to exist day after day, to eat, to earn, to pursue pleasures, to avoid pains. It hardly occurs to us to seek the meaning and the purpose of life. We do not live progressing from light to greater light, from love to deeper love, but stumble from confusion to corruption.

All Prophets and Perfected Men have pointed the Way, have spoken the Truth. We remain ignorant about such instruction; the *Gita* and the Upanishads, the *Gathas* and the *Kabbala*, the Sermon on the Mount and the Epistles of Paul, the greatest of the Apostles—these are instinct with a life of their own. Many read them; some read them with triple attention of eye, head and heart; but only the rare few attempt to accept the advice—"Mistrust thy senses, they are false"; or "Separate Head-learning from Soul-Wisdom," as is advocated; or bring the heart to "forsake every other religion and take refuge alone with the Great Self." We do not appreciate because we do not understand the promise contained in the potent words of Krishna: "I shall deliver thee from all thy transgressions."

There is the Path, there is Truth; if we find these the possibility of Living the Life is perceived and the experience of Immortality is assured.

How to find the Path? There are diverse ways which the knowledge of materialistic sciences, of speculative philosophies, of creedal theologies, tells us about. Broad are these paths, visible and accessible to all. But they have not led the educated and civilized man to the light, strength and peace of Truth. The Upanishads call this lower knowledge, and name the Wisdom of the Supreme as the Higher. But it is also taught that the Path to the Supreme True is inward—from thought and mind to Heart and Soul—and that the Science of the mystic and the occultist is hidden, esoteric, named *Gupta Vidya* and described as the Royal Wisdom. The search for that Way to Hidden Truth proceeds from the mundane and mortal mind to the Soul of Light in the Cave of the Heart. Awake, arise, seek the Great Teachers—it is said. Between the mortal and the Immortal there is The Bridge. What is that Bridge?

SHRAVAKA

TO MY UNKNOWN FRIENDS IN INDIA

[**M. Albert Guerard** is Lecturer in the Humanities at Stanford University, California. His new book, *Fossils and Presences*, has just been published and follows the lines of thought of his earlier volumes, *Testament of a Liberal* and *Bottle in the Sea*. Every thoughtful Indian will find the ideas of this essay written in a forthright style provocative and helpful. — ED.]

UNKNOWN, alas! I have read perhaps a hundred instructive books about India, without including Kipling's, or chatty travelogues. I have met, with pleasure and profit, perhaps a score of prominent Hindus, including Mr. Krishna Menon and relatives of Prime Minister Nehru. But my ignorance of your enormous and teeming subcontinent remains abysmal. Let me add that my interest, which is keen, and my sympathy, which is deep, have nothing to do with the fact that your country is enormous and teeming. Florence appeals to me more than Calcutta, Shanghai or Chicago. Values, not numbers.

In the murk of my ignorance, there are two rays of comfort and hope. The first is that conscious ignorance is less misleading than blurred and distorted knowledge. Everyone in America believes that he is familiar with French affairs and a fast friend of "our first ally, our Sister Republic." As a matter of fact, there is no country we so utterly fail to understand, with disastrous results. The second ray of hope — more positive, for it is a truism that hope is forward looking — is that with advancing years I have turned altogether from the past to the future. History, the object of my lifelong studies, has made us what we are, brought us into our present tragic chaos. The problem is not *Whence?* but *Whither?* Not yesterday which is past our power to alter, but tomorrow which we can still choose and shape. I believe in creative, converging evolution. The India, the Russia, the France, the America I am interested in, as "countries of the soul," not as territories or powers, are still ahead of us in the process of becoming. Let the India of yesterday, let the caste system, go, as feudalism, serfdom, monarchy by divine right, have gone. I believe in anthropology, the study of cultural patterns, as I believe in immunology: let us master the obstacles to be overcome. My stand is the reverse of Burke's: there is no wisdom in prejudice. In Gospel terms: let the dead bury their dead.

So my message to my Indian friends will not be what we can teach India, nor what we can learn from India, but what we can hope from India. Magnitude is of small import, and antiquity is a burden: what counts is the promise. There was once, and I believe there still is, a "promise of American life." It has grown dim because it has grown gross:

partly on account of partial fulfilment, mostly on account of smugness. America has been a great experiment: it has taught us what to seek—and how *not* to seek it. I am watching the great Indian experiment: India, an infant among the great organized families of mankind, has what we possessed in 1776: the freshness, the innocence, the hopefulness of dawn.

What I dimly see or feel in India is first of all the primacy of religion. By religion I do not mean formal religions or formal creeds: I understand that Mr. Nehru is not an orthodox believer. I mean the acknowledgement of the spirit as the essential reality. Material achievements I do not contemn: may your five-year plans be gloriously fulfilled! There is a virtue in accepted poverty, *i.e.*, in the simplification of life: there is no virtue in famine, pestilence and squalor. Material progress is good, if it helps liberate us from worldly care; it is harmful if it adds to our burden. The French have a good expression for moderate wealth: "*Il est à son aise,*" he lives in easy circumstances. The wealth that creates worry, un-ease, is a curse. May India grow rich, but under spiritual guidance. May it never be said: "India's business is Business."

In this subordination of the material to the spiritual, I include the materialistic aspects of all the sects: crudely faulty science, clumsy primitive myths about the creation or the end of the world, false history, ritual, ecclesiasticism, and most of all literalism, for the letter killeth. All these may be, at one moment, necessary props for the stumbling soul; but they may, and at a certain point they must, be tossed aside. I understand that in India many superstitions are rife; but that as a vast culture group India is not committed, as America is in fact, to a closed canon of divinely inspired and literally infallible books, to a set of dogmas (even if they be called "natural religion") as definite as industrial specifications. Nor is she committed, as Russia is officially, to a stifling faith in materialistic science. There are no unalterable blue prints in the realm of the spirit. My India (is it a Cloudland?) is a country where no man is handicapped because of his beliefs or lack of beliefs.

The consequence of this primacy of the free spirit is that India—my dream of India, my dream for India—stands for the refusal to accept power—material force, ultimately violence—as a final argument. In this I believe that India is best fitted to lead us into the path of constructive peace. America does lip service to the Christian faith but has abjured the Christian spirit. She has adopted such slogans as "Force without stint," "Unconditional surrender," "There is no substitute for victory," "Discussing from a position of strength," "massive retaliation." All these proud affir-

mations can be summed up in the old "Jingo" song: "We've got the guns, we've got the men, and we've got the money too." Power politics, idol of the realists, mean the ethics of the gangster. Fortunately, the accession of India to full independence was hailed by the world as a *moral* triumph, as the victory of non-violence. Between the two symbols, ludicrously unequal—General Dyer of Amritsar and Mahatma Gandhi—the world freely chose Gandhi—and yet did not take the lesson to heart. The Amritsar spirit still prevails in North and South Africa as well as in the Middle East.

Because India refuses to accept power (force, violence) as the final test of the right, I hope she will not seek a seat among the mighty by the side of Chiang Kai Shek, but that she will strive to abolish the invidious and immoral distinction between the Big, the Middling and the Small: "Have you guided missiles in store?" It might well be that Switzerland, Finland, Uruguay, could teach lessons from which all might profit. It is for India to prove that a giant's brain is not necessarily befuddled or paralyzed by the fact of being a giant.

So I am ready to welcome India's leadership away from the cult of sheer power. This position I should prefer not to call Neutralism. There are in the word "neutral" unpleasant connotations of weakness, cowardice, castration. The judge is not neutral between right and wrong; neither is the scientist so between true and false. The proper term would be non-partisan, even anti-partisan, or, more positively, *judicial*. Judge a case on its own merits, without fear or favour. This is what President Eisenhower and the British Labour Party did when they condemned aggression during the Suez crisis; even though, in order to do so, they had to censure their best friends and to be "fellow travellers" with Russia. This is what Prime Minister Nehru did when he deprecated the brutal methods by which the Hungarian insurrection was suppressed, even though he probably was more in sympathy with the professed ideals of the Socialist government in power than with those of the insurgents who sought to restore the ancient *règime*. And his courageous stand made him for once a fellow traveller with Secretary Dulles. Let no national, doctrinaire or partisan shibboleths swerve us aside from truth and justice. If India would keep up and strengthen her leadership in that direction, I for one would pray that France, England, and ultimately the half-blind giants, Russia and the United States, would follow in her steps.

There is a subject which for over six decades has been for me not a hobby but a conviction, *viz.*, the adoption of an international language as

both the symbol and the instrument of world unity. Now India, I understand, is even more of a babel than Western Europe. She needs a common language, for commercial, administrative and cultural purposes. To preserve English—used at present by a distinguished, educated minority—is to hark back to the days of Queen Victoria; to substitute Hindi is to hark back to the days of Akbar. English would be more *neutral* (non-partisan) than Hindustani: it would not reduce the other tongues—some of which are mighty languages—to the status of provincial dialects. But why not look forward, beyond the dreams of Akbar, Macaulay or Disraeli? Why should not India aspire to be the pioneer in the adoption of a world language, and make it officially her own?

This may seem Utopian: but there is an immediate practical approach. The UNESCO meeting at Montevideo urged that the question of a world auxiliary language[1] be investigated: let India support and implement this proposal with all her might. The promise that she herself would adopt it would be a decisive argument.

For a country to commit itself to an international institution or instrument is by no means unprecedented. Nations new and old have declared that they were discarding their local weights and measures, in spite of immemorial associations, in favour of the metric system. France and Italy in the preamble of their constitutions have declared their readiness to abandon their absolute sovereignty and to submit to world law. Why should not India take a step of the same kind in the linguistic field? It would actually be the best solution to her own internal linguistic problem, and a lesson in constructive world citizenship.

The greatness of India is harmony within pluralism: an infinite variety of racial stocks, creeds, forms of worship, local customs, languages, seeking and achieving unity in the quest of peace and brotherhood. This ideal is valid, not for India alone but for all mankind. India can best realize herself by transcending herself: not by attempting to become a monolithic nation of the outmoded Hitlerian Reich type: one, jealously one, in race, thought, speech, faith. My dream is that India should "mundialize" herself as a number of European cities have done: declare herself a conscious unit in that commonwealth prophesied by George Washington, "the Great Republic of Humanity at large."[2]

ALBERT GUERARD

---

[1] The word *Esperanto* was used as a synonym for a world language; but Unesco should not be committed in advance to any scheme: Esperanto, Cosmoglotta, Interlingua or Basic.

[2] 1938; Vol. XXVIII, p. 520.

THE REAL SIGNIFICANCE OF "FRIENDLINESS" IN BUDDHISM

[**Shri S. K. Ramachandra Rao** is a well-known scholar of Buddhist lore and a sincere practitioner of the Master's teachings. In this article he has written about the well-known quality of *metta*, which is more than friendliness; it is a Compassion for all the different kingdoms of the entire universe. Whatever the discipline of the spiritual life, Hindu, Buddhist, Christian or Muslim, Love and Compassion are regarded as the primary virtues to be cultivated, with the basis of *vairagya* or Dispassion. In the language of *The Voice of the Silence*, "Compassion is no attribute. It is the Law of Laws—eternal Harmony, Alaya's SELF; a shoreless universal essence, the light of everlasting right, and fitness of all things, the law of Love eternal." Every aspirant trying to live the Higher Life will find valuable ideas in this article.—ED.]

OF THE ten lifelong vows a Buddhist monk is enjoined to observe the very first is the resolve not to injure life (*panatipata*). In the eightfold path formulated by the Buddha, the primary constituent of the step concerning "right actions" is this restraint from injuring life. For the unshakable deliverance of mind (*ceto-vimutti*), which is the goal of every Buddhist aspirant, the second obstacle (*nivarana*) to be overcome is ill-will (*vyapada*); and this is said to be overcome by the practice of "friendliness." Among the seven stages of purity enumerated by the scholiasts, purification of mind (*cittavisuddhi*) figures prominently; and for the attainment of this, forty exercises are suggested, one group thereof being designated as "cultivation of sublime states"; here, of the four such states, the first one is *metta*, or friendliness. And this is characterized as a quality that makes the Buddha (*buddhakarakadhamma*), a state of perfection (*parami*) practised by all the Awakened Ones. In the little handbook,[1] which the earnest Buddhist uses daily, an important section pertains to "the discourse on friendliness." Buddhaghosa, the eminent exegetist, devotes a long and inspiring section in his *Visuddhimagga* to the practice of *metta*.[2] The *Jataka* tales abound in episodes extolling this virtue. Even the *abhidhamma* metaphysics considers this as an "immeasurable" (*appamanna*).

In a gospel that insists on turning one's back on society, on an austere and severe mode of life and on the practice of secluded contemplation,

---

[1] *Khuddakapatha*. The section is "*Mettasutta*"; this is also included in the *Suttanipata* collection.

[2] Ch. 9 (*Brahmaviharinidde so*).

it is not a little surprising that friendliness, which is the strongest cement in social relations, should figure so prominently. But its import is not social; the Buddha's approach to the problem of pain was not merely human. It is unjust to the stature of the Buddha to reduce him to the rank of a social thinker. He was, in fact, a preacher of the doctrine styled as "cross-current" (*patisota*), cross to the normal life of men. A suspicion leaks through the Pali texts that the Sakyan sage, during at least the early years of his ministry, was to his contemporaries "a snatcher of sons, a maker of widows, a breaker of homes"—the allusion is to his call for "home-leaving" (*pabbajja*). His early followers indeed were social runaways; they wandered about without relations of whatever kind or dwelt in jungles, "bending their minds towards emancipation." They were, in the Master's own words, like uprooted palm trees.

The Buddha's offer to mankind was the possibility of leading a higher life—higher than household, higher than society. This higher life was characterized by freedom; freedom implied the elimination of all barriers, and affection verily is the strongest barrier. Of the three fires that continually burn mankind, this affectionate attachment (*raga*) is the foremost; its accessories are mental clouding (*moha*) and aversion (*dosa*). This threefold fire has to be quenched in order that the higher life may be lived. Affection in the sense of an attitude of mind that limits the sympathy, confines the attention, intensifies the feeling of dependence, has obviously no place in the programme for higher life. But aversion, too, is an ill that must needs be eliminated, and how can it be eliminated without recourse to affection? The very Pali texts say that aversion is counteracted by the cultivation of friendliness (*mettabhavana*).

The Pali word for aversion is *dosa*; its equivalents are repugnance (*patigha*) and ill-will (*vyapada*). It is described as an unwholesome root. Ethically it is aversion, hate; but, on deeper analysis, it is the "violent striking of mind at an object."[3] Although physically and in a gross sense one who hates turns away from the object that he hates, psychologically it implies a violent approach. To counteract this, turning away (acts of renunciation often imply this) is no solution. The farther we attempt to run, the faster the mind sticks to what is left behind; pulling and pushing are not methods to tame the mind. The opposite of *dosa* is *adosa* (non-aversion), or, to put it positively, *metta* (in Sanskrit, *maitri*). The latter word is hard to translate: it means loving-kindness, sympathetic interest, friendliness, amity. Psychologically it is the "inclination of mind in the

[3] *Vipassanadipani* (Ledi Sayadaw).

direction of the object." The approach aspect is still there, but there is no violence about it, no striking. It is interesting to note that its equivalent *avyapada* signifies peace of mind. The mind moves, but it is free of emotional content.

The cultivation of friendliness as a spiritual exercise is said to induce the first three of the four intent states of mental absorption (*jhana*). In the first *jhana*, the mind is dissociated from the object and its own craving; and there is instituted *piti*, which term connotes joy, satisfaction, zest. A thirsty, weary traveller on a difficult road on a summer day finds himself on the banks of a rivulet of clear, cool water; and his satisfaction at this is *piti*. In the second *jhana*, *piti* gives rise to *sukha* (enjoyment); in the above simile, the traveller's happiness when he has quenched his thirst and rested his limbs. The realization that even *piti* is a distraction leads to the third *jhana*, wherein *upekkha* (equanimity, indifference) looms large. Thus the perfection of friendliness eliminates both affection and interest. It is clear that the narrowing of attention to any particular object or group and the concentration of interest and sympathy on it are not what *metta* signifies in Buddhism.

What then is the significance of *metta*? The term is defined as intention to engender benefit and happiness (*hitasukhupanayanakamata*).[4] Buddhaghosa explains that its practice stamps out repugnance (*patigha*) and stamps in forbearance (*khanti*).[5] The latter, it is well known, is deemed the highest of penances: "a renunciant will neither strike nor trouble another."[6] This wording, which belongs to the early strata of canonical composition, being employed originally as a *patimokkha* text, is negative and this is significant. It does not suggest an ideal of positive social service or a deliberate attempt to promote the welfare of others; it is more a personal discipline. Among the benefits of the practice of *metta*, as enumerated in an old non-canonical but celebrated tract, there is no mention of its effect on society, community or even household: "the practiser sleeps pleasantly, wakes up fresh, undisturbed by anxious dreams."[7]

That the social ideal was not involved in the conception of *metta* is further evident from the actual method of its practice as detailed by Buddhaghosa. At the very start (*sabbapathamam*), the aspirant will confine his attention to himself, and, his entire body being bathed with thoughts

[4] *Suttanipat'atthakatha.*

[5] *Visuddhimagga*, Ch. 9, Sec. 2.

[6] *Dhammapada*, 184.

[7] *Milindapanho*, IV (*Mendakapanha*), 16.

of friendliness, he should wish well for himself: May I be happy, not troubled, without malice, without passion, without taint! May I carry myself well! Then in gradual measures he must extend the orbit of his friendliness to comprehend all men, all animals, all living creatures, all things that struggle with ego-feelings. Included, too, are plants and stones, here and elsewhere, for *metta* must radiate all round, regardless of objects. The important process during this practice is "breaking down the lines of demarcation between individual entities" (*simasambhedana*).[8]

No doubt the welfare of society and mankind follows as a corollary from the successful practice of friendliness; but it must be recognized that it is not intended primarily to serve this end. The river is of course a great benefit to the people living along its banks; but does the river flow just for their sake? The gospel of Buddha is essentially for the individual: its aim is not to better man's role in society or to make him a more efficient social animal, but to improve the very nature of man in order that he may be freed from all ills, present and future. In this refinement of the human constitution, the outlook of unbounded affection and friendliness to everything around is a necessary ingredient. The Buddha's intent has aptly been expressed by one of his early followers, the forest-dwelling Revata:[9]—

> Since I left home in favour of the monk's life, I have not harboured a thought that is ignoble or fraught with hate. Creatures may die, prosper or suffer; but in this long interval, I have no thoughts whatever. I cherish the immeasurable friendliness that I have cultivated well — in stages as the Buddha taught. I am friend to all, and all living things I love. I make become the mood of friendliness; and ever I dwell with a peaceful mind.

These verses are included in the canonical collection of the poetic outbursts of early Buddhist monks, and here are the enchanting original lines:—

> Yada aham pabbajito agarasma' nagariyam,
> nabhinandami samkappam anariyam dosasamhitam.
> Ime hannantu vaddhantu dukkham pappontu panino;
> samkappam n' abhijanami imasmim dighamantare.
> Mettam ca abhijanami appamanam subhavitam,
> anupubbam paricitam yatha Buddhena desitam.
> Sabbamitto sabbasakho sabbhabhutanukampako
> mettan cittam ca bhavemi abyapajjarato sada.

S. K. RAMACHANDRA RAO

---

[8] *Visuddhimagga*, Ch. 9, Sec. 12.

[9] *Theragatha* (Khadiravaniya-Revata), 14. 1. 1.

SOMETHING THAT NEVER HAPPENED BEFORE

[**Mr. Roy Bridger**, examining the "perpetual emergency" of our day, goes to the heart of the dilemma posed by nuclear weapons and the obstacles to disarmament. Seeking to place the responsibility for their threat, he disconcertingly brings most of us into the dock. He is right in seeing a greater menace than the atom bomb represents in the mentality that can contemplate using it; he rightly hails as a hopeful sign the withdrawal of a big military power like Britain from Egypt at the behest of world opinion. We pin our hopes for world peace more on ideas, the "universal common denominators and perhaps new ways of life altogether," of which also he writes. He has brought out well the complexities of the problems of banning nuclear-weapon tests and of disarmament, and the impossibility of solving them in isolation. As Mr. Bridger wrote to us, "We have reached a stage of *stored-up crisis*, not only in warfare but in the whole of our technology, and in our basic materialist philosophy."—ED.]

ON ALL SIDES it is evident that we have entered a period of perpetual emergency of a kind never previously experienced in known history. As Professor Roger Heim, President of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, has summarized it: "Man has become a prisoner of the mechanical consequences of his powers of invention."

When man set out to improve his standard of living with the aid of machines, themselves subject to continual improvement and increasing efficiency, he took a road which stretched away into the unimaginable future, a road which seemed to be entirely without end. Today, especially in the case of the more heavily mechanized countries, the situation can be seen to be getting out of hand. The road of everlasting progress looks suspiciously like a road to mass suicide through breakdown of biological stability.

The problem is brought out on vast, cataclysmic lines involving radiation damage fears and nuclear warfare threats; and it is brought out in a multitude of little unexpected ways. For instance, in America just now they are talking about the G-Line—the Gadget Line. This is the latest shape of the human form: with thickened waist and heavy thighs, overweight hips and distended paunch. It is the result of the thousands of labour-saving gadgets which have been pouring into American homes and industry for two generations and more. Machines are now doing what people did for themselves—but their owners have had to pay the penalty

in fitness. In theory, labour-saving devices should be introduced as a welcome boon to those sections of the world's population most in need, particularly to the millions of small cultivators struggling round the clock to keep up with the demands of the seasons. To some extent this is what has occurred, but the process is not turning out as it should. Those who already have are getting more than is good for them, the rest continue to go without.

In agricultural equipment something more efficient than the hoe is clearly an advantage; "dust-bowl" farming, using powerful tractors designed to plough ever deeper and faster, fleets of combine-harvesters whirling away precocious crops forced with chemical stimulants and preserved with poison sprays against equilibrium-restoring "pests"—is unbalanced efficiency run riot.

In the processing of foodstuffs, too, machines for refining and doctoring food to new degrees of incompatibility with the human constitution are appearing all the time, while other machines are engaged in the large-scale production of drugs to deaden Nature's warning pain signals.

It is in the military field, however, that the most immediately urgent crisis has been reached. As man started to perfect machines for improving his standard of living, so began the corresponding rise of his weapons of destruction. No one can doubt that the end of this particular road is near. Whatever there was to be said for an armaments industry offering improved spears and patent muzzle-loaders, it is evident that, when it can only go on turning out apparatus for destroying everything on the planet, it has outlived such uses as it may once have had.

Today man himself is almost out of the running. With automatism being increasingly applied to the apparatuses of comfort, all the powers at large will be working to apply it to the apparatuses of destruction. It seems no more than a childish fancy to suppose that the extreme potency of the new weapons will act as a deterrent; there are plenty of fanatics mad enough to blow up, not merely whole cities, but the whole earth, if the switches are allowed to get into their hands. But, in any case, the machines are going all out to get the switches into their own hands.

Scarcely less disturbing is the extreme slowness of the rate of penetration of a sense of the impending crisis into the general consciousness. Yet such is its stored-up magnitude that even the firmest of our institutions and habits of thought is in danger of becoming obsolete. Language itself is becoming less and less adequate. Whole groups of words are being left standing, their meaning eaten away from inside as if by termites. Our notions of "defence," for instance, of what is being defended and what it

is being defended against, are almost completely out of date. Our minds are still clouded by phantasms of the Armada assembling at Cadiz, of Van Tromp sailing up the Thames.

The situation today is that under present conditions there is no longer a single cause worth going to war about. Not one. The "causes" on behalf of which people have formerly gone to war are dropping out of the picture. It is the *means* of war that is now the great threat, filling all the stage.

Some forty years ago a Western line-up against Communism began to take place. The process has gone on till this day; although the clash is ostensibly between Communism and anti-Communism, the forces now operating do not correspond to the original labels. Marked political and economic differences still exist, but "Communism" pure and simple is not the supreme terror. It isn't the creed that is feared, it is the instrument of applying the creed. It is applied materialism run riot, an unquestioning belief in "science." The latest is the earth satellite, a triumph of ingenuity, whatever its implications. But, if we felt that the Russians were mastering the *life* sciences (as distinct from the physical sciences) on this scale, we should feel a lot more reassured.

The West believes in science, too, of course, but nowhere nearly so blindly; in fact large sections of Western thought have been aware of the snags for some time; concerned not so much with rushing on towards wonders new as with putting a brake on a runaway machine. We cannot put the clock back. We cannot even get it to stand still. But at least we ought to try to regulate it. The question is, how?

Radiation risks being what they are, a movement has arisen to put a ban on further nuclear-weapon testing. Unfortunately, this is a good deal easier said than done, as the absence of results has shown. The case for abolition of nuclear-weapon testing might seem unanswerable when considered in isolation, but in practice it cannot be considered in isolation. This is the trouble all the way through — no shortage of slogans recommending various self-contained moves, but a great dearth of integrated programmes.

In practice the question of the abolition of nuclear-weapon testing is tied to the question of abolition of nuclear-weapon manufacture, since no one is likely to go on stock-piling weapons that have never been tested. One must go at the very least one step further and call for both.

This is what most abolitionists have done, it is true. But if real wars are going to be fought at all, whether in the cause of world conquest or in defence of hearth and home, there is unlikely to be any "gentlemen's agreement" on where to draw the line. The one object on both sides will

be to get hold of the deadliest possible weapons and to use them to the limit. Governments are not prepared to leave preparations until the last minute, hence full speed ahead with the testing of nuclear weapons.

Thus another big step is called for: the banning of *all* weapons. Again, this is a very worthy idea, but it is not going to be put into practice at the wave of a wand. Weapons of war are also the instruments of police work; a prerequisite of their abolition is therefore the removal of not only the need for war but the need for police work—a tall order.

There is one important qualification to be made, however, at this stage. Although weapons of war and instruments of police work be one and the same, the respective conditions are very different. A national police force requires only the lightest of weapons. It has no opposition of any consequence to overcome, since the public has surrendered its right to use weapons. If a world police force *to which the nations surrendered this sovereign right to use weapons* could be brought into being, the whole complex problem of disarmament would dwindle away.

Perhaps, after all, the Suez affair was not in vain, if it helped to push things in this direction a little. Britain lost a good deal of face both in going into Egypt and in coming out, but perhaps the only really noteworthy thing was that a big military power, acting in what it took to be a just cause, should have called off hostilities at the behest of world opinion. To go down thus into history is worth losing a little face.

Failing the establishment of a world police force, the problem remains critical in the extreme. There is not only the difficulty of separating war materials from routine police equipment, but the difficulty of separating them from routine technological progress, or what is practically universally identified as progress. Who will venture to assert that all this must stop? No more rockets; no more satellites; no more talk of exploring space. And, even if someone did suggest this, is there the faintest chance of any heed being taken? It's a very, very tall order.

Besides, for very many people today there is rather more involved than mere principles. They have their very livelihood to think of. It is nothing uncommon to read of protests against the "threatened" closure of some obsolescent arms factory being made by the workers in it. And it is not simply the workers in the armaments industries who, by the nature of the set-up, are inhibited from making a clear-cut call for disarmament. It is an innocuous industry indeed today that does not help to feed the military machine—and to profit thereby. Vast numbers of other people are "interested" indirectly, through investments. It is becoming less and less easy to invest savings, even in the Post Office, without helping to finance

the latest developments in rocket and guided-missile construction. A new twist is added by the rise of over-the-counter unit trust shares, interested as much in overseas as in home investments and making allocations in the world's atomic "advances" available to even the smallest investor. Now, under the British Labour Party's new nationalization plan, the largest investor in the "leading" industries will be the State. You carry the set-up and the set-up carries you, the whole thing as apparently unstoppable as an automatic bottling factory.

The H-bomb is the transcendent zenith of futility. But the fall-out of responsibility for it is spread very wide indeed. It is easy for the public to blame the diplomats when disarmament conferences fail. Yet, so far from the diplomats letting the public down, may it not be the other way round? According to Sir Charles Petrie, the historian, the First World War was not caused by the professional diplomat, as popularly believed. "It came about because in several countries the mass of the people wanted a fight, and it was more than their rulers could do to stop them." It could not be said that today the masses want war; in the so-called "free" economies of the West it is subtler, but no less insistent, pressures that are the trouble.

What is the most terrifying thing in the world? The H-bomb? No. The most terrifying thing in the world is the mentality that can contemplate using it. The mentality that cannot, even now, see that mankind is advancing at breakneck speed along the wrong road and that no time must be lost in seeking a different one.

It is not weapons that we shall have to rely on in the future. It is ideas, and they will need to be more universally acceptable than the conventional stock-in-trade. The world is quite prepared to scrap its obsolete steam engines and dynamos, says Undershaft in Shaw's *Major Barbara,* "but it won't scrap its old prejudices and its old moralities and its old religions and its old political constitutions."

It is a question of hard work all along the line, of much heart-searching in quest of workable world systems and universal common denominators, perhaps of new ways of life altogether rather than the existing set-up purged of nuclear weapons of war or of all weapons of war or even of all instruments of force. Not to think in terms of waving some magic wand which will remove the snags from the present picture, leaving everything else as before, but to begin at the other end with homelier realities. We have lived too long in an intellectual stratosphere. We need to come back to Mother Earth.

ROY BRIDGER

ARE ALL RELIGIONS EQUALLY TRUE?

[In this thought-provoking essay **Dr. William Henry Harris, Ph.D., (Boston)** of the Department of Philosophy of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Illinois, U.S.A., offers some ideas on Religion and differences in religions. Dr. Harris specializes in the philosophy of religion and Asian philosophies. The view presented on this subject by H. P. Blavatsky in her article "Is Theosophy a Religion?" contains similar thoughts presented half a century ago. Furthermore, H. P. Blavatsky's article presents a profounder and completer view, which our readers will do well to examine. — Ed.]

Perhaps the most serious questions now faced by the philosophy of religion are those raised by the new contacts between world religions. Of course contacts between the world religions are nothing new, nor is reflection upon their competing claims to truth. For example, their relationship to Greek and Roman religions as well as to Judaism was one of the most difficult problems faced by Christian thinkers from the time of Paul until the fall of Rome. The new political independence of Asian cultures, however, has changed the character of their contacts with the West. The scope of contact between cultures is far greater than it has ever been before. Fortunately the contact between world religions comes at a time when they are more intellectually renascent than they have been for centuries.

One thing upon which all religions agree is a claim to be true. Any adequate descriptive definition of a religion must recognize the high seriousness of its claim, and the way that this distinguishes religion from other fundamental approaches to experience such as art, science and moral obligation.

The following definition of religion may bring out this basic agreement among religions and give us a basis for deciding claims to truth: Religion is the expressed conviction that its fundamental values are in harmony with Reality. No one's religious conviction extends to all of his values. Each of us desires or prefers many things which are not fundamental to the basic integration of his personality, which may, in fact, be in conflict with those fundamental values upon which his existence is centred. But if we have a core of values without which we feel we could no longer exist, and if we express the audacious conviction that these values are sustained by Reality (all that is or could be), then we are religious. Religions differ enormously in the values they hold to be fundamental and in their conceptions of the Reality which sustains these values. There are

great differences in the self-consciousness with which the religious conviction is realized. But all religions must resist claims that values have no objective referent and that cognitive truth is not relevant to religion.

Religion is different from moral obligation, for obligation is experienced by many who feel that the universe as a whole is indifferent or even hostile to those values which they are obliged to create or defend. Religion is different from science, for the ideal of science (impossible to realize) is the description and prediction of our experience without regard to what we desire or prefer. Religion is different from art, for the artist may express evanescent emotions altogether different from the values of his previous work and with no thought as to whether his values are in harmony with the structure of that which is or could be. Religion is concern about some fundamental core of values. It not only claims that they are good; it always believes that they are true. It is misunderstood by the literalist who feels that the truth of his religion lies in the historicity of its scripture rather than in the values it expresses. It is misunderstood by those who equate its concern for values with poetry or ethics.

If this definition of religion is adequate, it is foolish to say that all religions are equally true or to say, as the positivists do, that all religions are equally false. It seems that the supremacy and purity of the Aryan "race" has been for some people a sincerely religious conviction in the sense in which we have here defined religion. We either live in a world which sustains such a conviction or we do not. If we do confront a Reality which harmonizes with this evaluation of the Aryan race, then it must be to some degree indifferent or hostile to the value of inter-racial brotherhood. And the fact that evidence can be produced that biological, historical, or social processes are hostile to one or the other of these fundamental values does not prove that all religions are equally untrue, or that religious values are merely subjective.

A religion, therefore, may be more or less true according to the way that its ultimate values harmonize with what is or could be. Religions differ widely in symbols, institutions and the theologies by which they conceptualize Reality and its relation to their ultimate values; but some of them may still be in large agreement upon ultimate values. We can see, as well, that some religions may be in basic contradiction regarding ultimate values.

Are there any criteria by which we can criticize our values and decide upon their truth? I believe that there are. In neither knowledge about values nor knowledge of sensory facts can we escape our egocentric predicament. Values are always specific and particular; we never desire or

prefer abstractly. But the norms by which religious values can be judged must always be so abstract as to apply to all value judgments, for here the question is of the relation of value judgments to the structure of Reality itself. If our alleged norms are not sufficiently abstract they are simply values among other values and no help in measuring their correspondence to Reality.

What are some of the things which may prove to be criteria for the truth of religion? I would suggest that they might include: consistency, universality, enhancement and fruitfulness. Truth about values, like truth about sensory experience, must be seen in terms of probability. But those values which are consistent, universal, enhancing and fruitful, would seem to be most in harmony with the structure of Reality. Probability increases as more of these requirements are met.

In order to condemn or justify specific values we would have to examine them long and carefully in the light of biological, social and historical processes. It might, however, be useful to illustrate the application of the criteria we have suggested. For instance, world peace and love of motherland have both been the basis of widely held religions. But to include both the worthiness of world peace and the worthiness of a motherland among our core values is to deny religion in two ways. First it denies that integration of self which is one of the roots of the inner peace which faith always brings. Second, it denies to the structure of Reality that unity which knowledge must presuppose. If there can be no mere English geometry, or only Chinese physics, Reality also cannot be in harmony with values which obviously are not true. There may be tensions within Reality, but ultimate frustration would make a knowable universe impossible. And if we are considering ultimate Reality, universality is unavoidably implied by the same arguments which support internal consistency. We all have values not necessarily shared by others, but to the extent that they make the realization of our values by others impossible, our values cannot be true ones. This does not mean that the values of uniqueness and privacy cannot be religiously true; it does mean that values which entail destructive competition or deprivation of others should never be made religious ones.

A true value always enhances our realization of other true values. A true value is always fruitful in making possible further values. Appeal to experience is a familiar one in all great religious traditions. It does not imply a shallow form of pragmatism. It does mean that living, rather than rational criticism alone, must be the test for our religious values. This seems to be in keeping with what William Ernest Hocking some years

ago called "negative pragmatism": —

> If a theory has no consequences or bad ones; if it makes no difference to men, or else undesirable differences; if it lowers the capacity of men to meet the stress of existence, or diminishes the worth to them of what existence they have; such a theory is somehow false, and we have no peace until it is remedied . . . . Whatever doctrine tends to draw the fangs of reality, and to leave men unstrung, content, complacent, and at ease, that doctrine is a treachery and a deceit. Note well that it is not pleasantness but force that sets the mark for truth: we have to require of our faith not what is agreeable to the indolent spirit but what is at once a spur and a promise.[1]

The view that we have sketched is in opposition to the view that one religion is true and all others are false. This claim to unique truth has two forms and has been made in one form or the other by adherents of each of the world religions. The more severe form of this claim is that the error of other religions is total and that their highest expressions only make them more dangerously delusive. A more common position is that the truth is fulfilled in one's own faith and that other religions in varying degrees approximate it. Even devotees of religions claiming great tolerance often seem to say something like this. In any form the claim to any one religion's supremacy of truth seems to be based on ignorance, or a denial of the enormous diversity of value systems among advocates of one's own religious tradition and especially among advocates of other religious traditions. The forms and symbols of each religion are often a cloak for the most particularistic, incoherent or debilitory values. Some religions may be too constricted to allow a very great development of true values. But each of the major religions has provided some scope for such development. If a person can understand the strange forms in which the values of a religion are expressed he often finds devotees of another religious institution closer to those values most central to himself than are the people within his own religious tradition. Once such a community of values has been discovered, devotees of any belief may join in the development of forms and institutions which more and more adequately express their common faith.

This does not say that all religions are equally true. Statements like that spring from the kind of sentimentalism which frustrates rather than stimulates religious inquiry and development. There may be truth in each

---

[1] *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912, pp. xiii-xiv. Also Cf. SWAMI VIVEKANANDA, "The Mission of the Vedanta," quoted in *The Yogas and Other Works*, New York: Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Centre, 1953., p. 119.

religion. Each religion may have some true value not developed in another. All religions must be continually examined before a Reality which their advocates can neither control nor perfectly reflect.

The development of more adequate conceptions of the way in which our values are sustained by Reality is the task of theology and the philosophy of religion. In this task information of developments in science and other fundamental approaches to Reality must be considered. Developments will thus help us to see more clearly which values are true. But religion itself is a conviction expressed upon our ultimate values. Mutual understanding and growth in religious conviction need not wait for agreement among theologies.

WILLIAM HENRY HARRIS

"THE ART OF THE DRAMATIST"

J. B. PRIESTLEY, in three wireless talks (*Listener*, December 5th, 12th, 19th) propounded a most stimulating theory on "The Art of the Dramatist." He has examined the nature and virtue of the drama itself, the fundamentals of the dramatist's work, the essentials of acting and production. But through the survey there runs one common theme — that the perfection of satisfaction is reached by the subtle interdependence of two apparently opposed things, producing an integrated whole. So Mr. Priestley speaks of the "dramatic experience" created by our response on two different levels of the mind at the same time. We are aware of reality and unreality simultaneously. Pleasure and appreciation cease when there is only a single response, as with the very young child to whom the play is frighteningly "real," and the unimaginative adult to whom it is completely unreal.

So it is in the delicate relation between belief and disbelief, between the dream life of the play and the real life in the play's presentation, between the stage as a window upon and an entrance into imaginary existences and the stage as an exhibition of highly technical skills, that our true dramatic experience has its roots and its being.

In the same way, the art of the dramatist lies in a duality. He must conceive and create his play "both in terms of its imaginative life and in terms of its theatrical presentation."

Here, it would seem, in this theme of two-in-one activity, we have something significant that should be applied not merely to the theatre, for it is as valid in its application to the great "drama of the soul" that we call our daily life. That too must be lived on two levels at one and the same time.

W.E.W.

HOW TO MAKE COMMUNISTS

[**Mr. Reginald Reynolds** is an internationalist with a real insight. He is a firm believer in the principle of Universal Brotherhood. In this article he speaks from personal experience after a visit to Japan.— ED.]

SOME COUNTRIES have gone Communist by a process of decay, just as maggots breed in a rotten cheese. Some have had Communism forced on them by aggression. If Japan goes Communist I suspect that it will be largely the result of American stupidity.

I have just returned from Japan, where I was impressed by many things: Japanese manners, cleanliness, honesty, poverty, industry and (in the struggle for existence) ruthlessness. But what matters most to us in the West is the Japanese dread of nuclear war and of nuclear tests.

This dread is something you feel at all levels and among people of all parties. To us the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are events of the past. To the Japanese these events are a dark shadow, still hanging over the land. Over a hundred thousand people still living, some maimed, some in apparent health, were exposed in varying degrees to the radiation from those two bombs. Twelve years after those bombs fell, any one of these people can at any moment show symptoms of leukemia. Death generally follows very soon.

Even the precise number of people exposed to radiation twelve years ago is unknown. One reason is that so many have concealed the fact. Young people fear—with good reason—that nobody will take the risk of marrying them; for the worst results are those arising from mutated genes, which may cause deformed or monstrous children. This can make a social leper of any young man, so far as marriage is concerned; so he may keep away from the hospitals as long as he can.

Now look at American policy against this background of terror. America has made Japan a great network of bases for its operations in the event of war. The Americans, and more recently the British, have used the Pacific for their nuclear tests, in spite of repeated protests from the Japanese. The present government in Tokyo is the equivalent of a Conservative government in London, but it has voiced, in vain, the fears of a whole nation.

Communist propaganda in Japan concentrates on these points. Every American base, they say, will be a target in war. In these small, overcrowded islands this will mean the extermination of the Japanese people, if the latest nuclear weapons are used. And who wants to abolish such weapons? Why, Russia, of course: but only by agreement with America

and Britain, who won't agree. (I am simply putting the argument as the Communists put it.) As to the tests, they affect the rain, the crops, the livestock and the fish. Fish occupy a predominant position in Japanese diet, second only to rice, for they are the chief source of protein. Nothing could be easier than to make effective anti-American propaganda out of such a situation.

Communists do not need to talk Communism. All they have to do is to exploit American blunders to create and fan anti-Americanism and to suggest that Russia and China are Japan's true friends. There are, of course, some awkward facts to be explained away or ignored. Much of the radio-active fall-out comes from Russian experiments; but Japan is naturally much more conscious of what goes on in the Pacific, where the entire crew of a fishing boat was directly affected by one of the American tests. And again, Russia has been a hard bargainer about Japanese fishing rights. But the Communists can still say that Russia and China have, at least, never established "bases" in Japan.

Nobody likes to put up with a foreign occupying force and it is beside the point to reply that a good many countries in the past endured Japanese occupation. (French resistance to German occupation was none the less vigorous because France had itself "occupied" so many colonies.) The objection to American occupation is simply a fact of which one finds evidence everywhere, and it is intensified by the knowledge that American bases in no sense "protect" the country, but make it more liable to deadly attack.

And among these people, so sensitive to the dangers as well as the humiliation of American occupation, there is also vivid memory of two cities annihilated as a demonstration of American power. The Communists never fail to remind people of that responsibility. Russia, they imply, would never have done a thing like that. And then, a little inconsistently, they imply that of course Russia might be forced to do the same sort of thing if the Americans continue to threaten them from Japanese bases.

Do not be deceived by the small size of the Communist Party today in Japan. It was very small in Indonesia only four years ago. Unless the Americans clear out of Japan they can, within a few years, create as big a change there as we have seen in Indonesia—for different reasons—and the implications of that change will be very serious. The only sure way to keep Japan from going that way is to stop provoking Japanese fear and resentment, to offer much-needed help to the country in its economic problems and to encourage Japan to regard itself as a neutral power. On that it should not be difficult to reach agreement with Russia and China.

But it is just that sort of common sense which is lacking in Anglo-American policy, especially in the Far East. I will pass over the more obvious danger spots: Korea and Formosa. The world has had plenty of time to reflect on the folly which has included the *régimes* of Syngman Rhee and the "Generalissimo" on his little island (bristling with armaments and aggressive intentions) as bastions of "The Free World." Let us consider one other powder barrel: Singapore.

Mr. Duncan Sandys himself, on a recent visit to Singapore, made it perfectly clear that the place cannot be defended against an attack with nuclear weapons. At the same time he made it equally clear that Great Britain intends to retain Singapore as a "base." So this useless "base" in what Mr. Sandys called the "defence of freedom" is, in fact, a meaningless defence of a freedom which does not exist for the people of Singapore, since they have no share in the "freedom" which is supposed to be defended.

The internal situation is almost equally depressing. In spite of a recent effort on the part of Mr. David Marshall (a rich and ambitious man) to split the working-class vote by creating a new "Workers Party," the strongest political group in Singapore is still the Peoples Action Party (P.A.P.), which has a mass backing. Its leader is Lee Kuan Yew. Strange to say, this Socialist party, in spite of its power outside the Legislature, has only three representatives in the Assembly. The reason must be sought in a Constitution which is typical of British colonialism.

With a heavy weightage of nominated members, including the key members of the Cabinet, the Government has effectively blocked the possibility of any real democracy within the existing Constitution, whilst making the usual parade of concessions to popular demands. The Peoples Action Party put up only four candidates, of whom three were elected in the last elections. It was a sufficient force to use the Assembly as a platform for the democratic opinion which the Constitution was designed to frustrate, whilst it avoided the temptations and compromises which might have been the result of a larger representation. The P.A.P. is pledged not to work the present Constitution.

We have, of course, separated Singapore from the Malayan Federation. Singapore remains a colony while the rest of the country celebrated its independence on August 31st. As a comment on the claim that freedom is granted to colonial peoples when they are "ready" for it, the whole business is an eye-opener. By our own standards Singapore and its people, more urban, more educated than the neighbouring states across the Causeway, might be assumed to have the better claim. If anybody has

the right to say when somebody else is "fit" for self-government, I should have expected the British, by British standards of "fitness," to have agreed with this. And so they would, no doubt, if Singapore had not been of such great military importance.

So they cut the country in two in a way which can only be understood if we try to imagine that the whole of Britain is independent except for London, which is ruled by the Chinese. Economically and politically the idea was and is obviously disastrous; but the Brass Hats demanded that it should be so. They had their way and Malaya will pay the price. In saying Malaya I include Singapore. Only by a political fiction can they be separated.

This is the setting for the internal problems of P.A.P. No "left" party, operating so near to the power house of Asian Communism, is safe from Communist infiltration—especially in a place like Singapore, with a predominantly Chinese population, plenty of poverty and so many living links with the New China.

The more outrageous the behaviour of Whitehall and its agents in South-east Asia, the more grist to the Communist mill. A man like Lee Kuan Yew knows that the answer to British colonialism is not to become a satellite of Red China. He does not want Communist ruthlessness in place of Britain's own peculiar mixture of ruthlessness, compromise and duplicity. So there he was fighting the Communist or near-Communist agents who had infiltrated into his own party, when the Government detained a number of them without trial. He would have been hardly human if one side of him had not welcomed their removal. But the honest democrat in him objected to this arbitrary way of dealing with opponents—even though they were his own opponents, as well as being opponents of the Government.

Even as a politician he can see that he must now fight for their rights or lose all claim to represent the masses against the Government. This is tough on Lee. If he does not fight for his opponents he will betray his own principles and the long-term interests of his party. If he does fight for them he makes heroes of them.

Was the Government stupid or diabolically clever? One way or the other they put the only effective opposition in the awkward position of having to lean—to all appearances—either towards Communism or towards British imperialism.

And nothing suits British policy better for the moment—if you identify British policy with British militarism and the investments it claims to protect. If a colonial leader, faced by such a dilemma, comes down (or

even appears to do so) on the side of Whitehall, we strengthen our position. If he takes the opposite course, he can the more easily be labelled a "Red" and discredited in the eyes of the Western World and even of many fellow countrymen. It is a new variation of "Divide and Rule."

At least, it will work like that for a time. But if the British force such a choice on any people in Asia it may not work out as they hoped. If they succeed in discrediting men like Lee Kuan Yew they are likely to find that the real and ultimate victory will go to the Communists.

If so, it will not be the first time that the British have driven a colonial people to despair and to desperate remedies. Already violence—in the form of a new outbreak of kidnapping—has shown a sinister increase in Singapore. Tension has become so bad that, even if the British were to quit tomorrow, it would be long before normal conditions could be restored. What is clear, however, is that the longer the British remain, the worse things will be; for the people have no imaginable future except indefinite subjection (with a steady increase in crimes of violence) or a sudden end, as dreadful as that of Hiroshima. And even there the choice will not lie with Singapore, but with blundering diplomatists and politicians in London.

I do not know whether to give the prize for stupidity to my own countrymen or to the Americans. They seem, at the moment, to be engaged in a frenzied competition to make Communists throughout Asia—from the Middle East to Tokyo.

REGINALD REYNOLDS

A SOFTER veil hath fallen over me,
    A sense of sweetness all unguessed before,
    A kindliness undreamed in days of yore,
Anticipation of some ecstasy,
The dawning of a future that may be—
    Some purblind groping for some unknown shore,
    Strangely far-off, meseems, yet furthermore
So strangely near, had I but eyes to see.

Spirit, be patient, wait—yet poised for flight;
    Alert, yet resting, eager to take wing,
    Serene and confident one dawn will bring
The Inner Vision which alone gives light
    And points the guerdon of the Path well trod,
    Conviction crowned with Knowledge: *Thou art God.*

T. L. CROMBIE

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

Broken Bread. Compiled, edited and translated by LILA RAY. (M. C. Sarkar and Sons, Private, Ltd., Calcutta. 260 pp. 1957. Rs. 7.00)

Broken Bread is an anthology of short stories by Bengali authors, and represents the period since Tagore, a period that has not been a happy one for Bengal, for, though the struggle against foreign domination resulted in freedom, the aftermath of division and internal discord has marred that freedom. The stories selected for this volume depict the authors' reactions to this unhappy phase.

The short story, in its present form, is a comparatively recent development in Bengali literature, and may be said to date from 1885 with two little phantasies of poetic beauty from the pen of Tagore. Peerless for his descriptive powers and gentle, dreamy expressiveness, Tagore could also wield the rapier of satire, and "The Rejection Slip," with which this volume opens, reveals the master's touch.

The modern Bengali writer evinces a genuine and sympathetic understanding of the peasant, and a strangely moving little tale that plucks at one's very heartstrings with its poignant simplicity is "The Trellis," by Bibhuti Bhushan Bandyopadhyay. Himself the son of a village story-teller, Bandyopadhyay delineates village life with insight and a rare feeling. Indian literature has suffered a great loss in the death, in early middle age, of this gifted writer.

American by birth, Shrimati Lila Ray resides in India with her husband who is a Bengali author of note, and her translations are executed with a delicate sensitivity and understanding that testify to her emotional affinity with the country of her adoption. The editing and production set a high standard, and the reading public owes a debt of gratitude to her for bringing out this anthology.

ROSHAN KOTHAWALA

The Golden Pomegranate: A Selection from the Poetry of the Mogul Empire in India, 1526-1858. By JOHN CHARLES EDWARD BOWEN; with decorations by the Author and 12 illustrations in colour by BALAI DAS. (Thacker and Co., Bombay. 96 pp. 1957. Rs. 25.00)

Major J. C. E. Bowen deserves our gratitude for setting before us this Golden Pomegranate of Mogul verse. The present reviewer knows neither Persian nor Urdu, but she has had the verses read to her by a friend and enjoyed their magic of phrase and haunting melody. Although much of the magic and the music is lost in the translation, Major Bowen is undoubtedly a competent translator and has succeeded in recapturing the spirit of the originals.

The Mogul period, so famous for its marvels of architecture and painting, was apparently no less distinguished for its poets, and Major Bowen has gathered here a little basketful of Mogul verse that must only whet our appetite for more. How poignant is this by Princess Jahanara, who longed — being an unhappy imprisoned woman — for the freshness of the open air at least after death:—

When death at last arrives to set
My prisoned body free
No vault shall contain my dust—but let
The green grass cover me.

Emperors like Babar and Bahadur Shah; an Empress like Nur Jahan; poet laureates like Ghalib and Abu Talib Kalim; Sa'ib, "the last great Persian

poet"; and — for a change — Sayed Raul Rasa, a contemporary Pushtu poet, are among the children of song figuring in these luxuriant pages. A simple verse, a few lines, and a whole philosophy is summed up (as in Ghalib's "Tavern Philosophy") or an intimate tragedy is insinuated (as in the anonymous "The Younger Sister").

The original verse and the English renderings are presented in a bright decorative framework suggestive of the splendours of Mogul architecture, while Balai Das — a pupil of Abanindranath Tagore — has rendered some of the poems in colour, uncannily evoking the background, the mood, the situation, as also the foreground actors.

The Golden Pomegranate is a treasure-house of beauty and song, and will adorn any library, private or public.

S. PREMA

Healing by Hand. By PARNELL BRADBURY. (The Harvill Press, Ltd., London. 108 pp. Illustrated. 1957. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

This much-needed book is packed with all the facts an intelligent layman wants to know about Chiropractic—the treatment of pain and disease through the spine. Parnell Bradbury not only writes about his subject in an absorbing and lively manner, but has behind him years of practical skill in healing by hand. A brilliant osteopath as well as a chiropractor, he has things to say about resistance to cancer and other diseases by spinal adjustment, practised in these two systems, which although officially accepted in the United States, have still to be given the blessing of the medical profession in Britain.

Few people are qualified to criticize chiropractors, but Mr. Bradbury is fully qualified to speak for them. He puts his case with great clarity and tolerance, and it would be a closed mind, indeed, that was not keenly interested in the methods of healing and the factual cures he reveals.

He is dead against vaccine as a protective measure for anterior poliomyelitis. As one who has suffered from this disease myself, I can only say that I know the orthodox treatment for polio, in this country and India, to be wrong. Mr. Bradbury is all for Sister Kenny, plus exercise and spinal adjustment. I recovered from polio without Chiropractic; but partly by luck and partly by intuition, I largely followed out the principles laid down by Mr. Bradbury, and I am physically very nearly normal today, while others I know, who were afflicted as badly as I, are still crippled after orthodox treatment.

Some may be sceptical of a healing art that tackles everything from lumbago to the common cold by spinal adjustment. But at the very least, after reading Mr. Bradbury's book, I predict that the most sceptical will find their doubts considerably qualified.

DENNIS GRAY STOLL

Ashtakavarga. By CHANDULAL S. PATEL and C. A. SUBRAMANIA AIYAR. Foreword by YESHWANT K. PRADHAN. (Messrs. Gopal Narayan and Co., Bombay 2. 288+39 pp. 1957. Rs. 10.00)

It is a moot question whether predictive astrology is an art or a science or a pseudo-science. In the hands of professional astrologers who know little Sanskrit and less mathematics the system has fallen into disrepute; therefore an objective presentation of the main principles involved, on the basis of the original texts, is a desideratum today. No judgment on the scientific value of astrology can be passed without such authoritative textbooks, and this book deserves the notice of all students of

astrology since it is the first reference book of its kind in English. It gives an exhaustive account of one chapter in Indian predictive astrology, *viz.*, the precise determination of the eight-fold influence of the major planets individually and collectively on the different houses in a person's horoscope at the time of birth. Such a determination will ensure a greater degree of accuracy in predicting the influence of planets in transit or *gocāra*. The specimen horoscope worked out in detail and the diagrams given to illustrate the nature of the calculations expected add to the value of the work. We eagerly await from the painstaking authors publication of similar documented studies on the other chapters of Indian astrology.

K. KRISHNAMOORTHY

Science and the Love of God. By FRANK J. PIRONE. (Philosophical Library, New York. 233 pp. 1957. $4.25)

After reading the title of this book, and a sentence on the dust cover describing it as "an attempt to answer in simple, non-technical language, the layman's most vexing questions about his place in the universe," it is disappointing to find that it is largely a plea for the tenets of Roman Catholicism. In his Foreword the author wins one's sympathy by his obvious care for his patients and his desire to bring spiritual aid to their healing.

Part I consists of twenty-four short chapters spoken to "Tommy" by his mother, mostly about science; but the later chapters deal with the "sacred science" (theology) and history. The language is reasonably simple—although marred by several grammatical errors — but the science, this reviewer believes, is far beyond Tommy's comprehension.

Part II is called, "Of the Mind Specifically." In a lengthy comparison between pronouncements made by the Pope to delegates to the Fifth International Congress on Psychotherapy and Clinical Psychology in Rome, 1953, and some of Freud's cruder statements, the Holy Father certainly shines. St. Thomas Aquinas is "the only thinker in all human history . . . capable of defining 'mind.' " Cancer is something written into the fabric of the universe as are decay and death; so it is useless to attempt to find a cure.

This book represents a brave piece of thinking; but it is not likely to appeal to non-Roman Catholics.

F. MARY BARR

Thoughts for Times Like These. By S. RALPH HARLOW. (Philosophical Library, New York. 181 pp. 1957. $3.00)

The author has taught in American colleges for forty years and in this book he seeks to apply what he chooses to call the Judæo-Christian ethic to the social and religious problems of our time. He strives sincerely to challenge and awaken America's loyalty to her tradition of justice and equality for all. At a time when many feel distressed at ominous signs of illiberalism in America, such a book gives cause for hope. The book consists of short essays or meditations on themes quoted from both the Old and the New Testaments. Not all will share his judgments or appreciate his very liberal interpretation of Biblical texts, but all of good will should appreciate his deeply sincere concern for world brotherhood and human equality. Much of what he says is peculiarly related to the American scene and he bravely attacks racialism and other evils.

That a teacher of this kind continues to speak to American youth is most encouraging.

LEONARD M. SCHIFF

Dynamics of Faith. By PAUL TILLICH. (World Perspectives, George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 127 pp. 1957. 9*s*. 6*d*.)

To the sceptical, who in self-defence are wont to oversimplify, Existentialism seems no more than a philosophical justification of having one's cake and ha'penny too. We are what our lives reveal us to be and not what we think we ought to be. It sounds simple—as though we were exempted from responsibility and effort. But the truth of the matter is the reverse of this. To become what we are, to be what we are, is the ultimate discipline. Dr. Tillich, for example, describes faith as a state of being "ultimately concerned":—

> Man's faith is inadequate if his whole existence is determined by something that is less than ultimate.

Existentialism, in other words, implies a maximum of responsibility and not a repudiation of responsibility.

In Dr. Tillich's interpretation of faith lies the subtlety, the paradox, which is at the heart of any great truth:—

> Many Christians, as well as members of other religious groups, feel anxiety, guilt and despair about what they call "loss of faith". But serious doubt is confirmation of faith. It indicates the seriousness of the concern, its unconditional character.

He believes that the life of faith involves both participation in the object of one's ultimate concern and separation from it; that faith and doubt are a necessary diastole-systole, and that without the intrusion of doubt, faith would become indifference. He concludes by reaffirming that faith is both possible and necessary today:—

> If faith is understood as what it centrally is, ultimate concern, it cannot be undercut by modern science or any kind of philosophy.

This little book will speak meaningfully to any independent soul. And if the pious church-goer could be persuaded to read it, should convince him that he has not hitherto understood that of which he imagined himself to possess a monopoly.

J. P. HOGAN

Encyclopedia of Morals. Edited by VERGILIUS FERM. (Philosophical Library, New York. x+682 pp. 1956. $10.00)

The Philosophical Library of New York has been doing remarkable work in publishing books of lasting value. Among these books more than fifty published volumes and about twenty-five forthcoming volumes belong to the series called "Mid-century Reference Library" edited by Dr. Dagobert D. Runes, PH.D. Every subject of vital interest to an average educated individual of the present-day civilized world is dealt with in these reference books. The *Encyclopedia of Morals,* finely planned and assembled by its editor, is a product resulting from the co-operation of about fifty scholars representing the leading colleges and universities in America. Some of these contributors have carried out first-hand investigations among illiterate peoples, who are representative of morals in their primitive expressions.

This volume has been planned on the theory that substantial articles rather than brief notations of widely scattered topics serve better to fulfil the purpose of reference information. Multitudinous ideas associated with morals have been treated in the contexts of the larger topics. Morals as exhibited in the views of theorists as also those exhibited in actual interpersonal and communal living have been represented in this volume. We feel confident that this ponderous volume will not fail to create interest among both the philosophers and the sociologists and anthropologists. All these features will no doubt add to a fuller understanding of the morals of mankind.

Among topics of Indian interest in this volume are: Hindu Ethics (pp. 213-223); Muslim Morals (pp. 274-381); and Zoroastrian Morals (pp. 653-661) by the late Dr. I. J. S. Taraporewalla.

In view of the great importance of the published volumes in the Mid-century Reference Library series, Indian readers will look forward with eagerness to the *Buddhist Dictionary* announced by the publishers.

P. K. GODE

Approach to Reality. By ANANT GANESH JAVADEKAR. (M. S. University of Baroda Research Series, No. 1. Oriental Institute, Baroda. 194 pp. 1957. Rs. 6.25)

This is the author's doctoral thesis. He maintains the view that the method of philosophy cannot be the same as that of other sciences. He argues at great length that we must not uncritically superimpose the completely impersonal, objective methods of the physical sciences on philosophy. He avows that "in philosophy it is particularly the personal element that counts most." He states in close conformity with the Indian philosophical tradition that perfect knowledge is not a mere matter of understanding: it is the result of the pure life of ethical excellence. In the last two sections, the author shows that pure knowledge is ethically determined. The knowledge of Reality is not the product of the discursive intellect. It is the result of intuition.

Intuition, as our author defines it, is not so much an independent faculty of knowledge; the purified being of the Knower itself constitutes its enlightenment (p. 165). Such a definition applies to mystic experience and spiritual realization, and may not apply to other types of intuition, e.g., the æsthetic, the scientific, etc.

The last chapter of the book discusses the relation between virtue and knowledge. The author quotes profusely from three Indian texts, the *Gita*, the *Yoga-Sutras* and the *Narada-Bhakti Sutras*. He concludes his thesis on the Socratic note "virtue is knowledge." The Upanishad declares: "that is knowledge which liberates." The *Katha Upanishad* tells us, "Unless a man has refrained from doing wrong, and is entirely composed, and has a pacified mind, he cannot know Reality even by knowledge." Our knowledge of things is determined by several factors, and the ethical should not be neglected.

Our author has done well to represent a viewpoint which is being constantly assailed.

P. NAGARAJA RAO

National Communism and Soviet Strategy. By D. A. TOMASIC. (Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C. 222 pp. 1957. $4.50)

The long conviction of the Russian Marxists that nationalism is inconsistent with Communism, which is internationalist and brings the workers of the whole world into one monolithic organization under the control of the Comintern, is slowly giving place to a new idea, with the successful rise to power of Tito and Mao. Titoism stands for national Communism. Its success gave hope to other nations like Poland, though Poland has not obtained as much independence of Cominform control as Yugoslavia. However, the Kremlin now realizes that in some way the aspirations of the nations under its control have to be recognized and conceded without disintegration of the Communist front or giving up its global strategy. A new policy has to be framed.

Professor Tomasic suggests that the new Kremlin policy visualizes a new

structuring of states for global victory. At the centre lies the Soviet Union. Its outer ring consists of the satellite states completely under its control. Surrounding them lie autonomous states, like Yogoslavia, which are Communist. Outside them lies another ring of neutralized but Soviet-oriented states. Next lie the countries rife with tensions, internal and external. Outside them lies the enemy itself. Thus Tito was made to fit into the new policy. But Professor Tomasic concludes that the success of the Communist policy depends on whether the multitudes under its rule get their basic needs and longings satisfied or not.

Policies are meant for politicians, and certainly politicians must give serious thought to Professor Tomasic's suggestion about the change in Kremlin strategy. But what is shocking to the general thinking man is the blood in which the Communist rise to power is bathed everywhere. History condemned monarchs who ascended the throne after murdering their fathers and relatives. Now we read that some members of the Party were purged because of their humanistic thinking (p. 160); and that humanism is opposed to Marxism-Leninism. This is a revelation to those who think that Marxism is a form of humanism, though based upon economic relationships. Next, the reader should note what Djilas protested against, namely, the rise of two new classes in Communist states, the bureaucracy and the people. The bureaucracy is the Party that tries to perpetuate itself in power and is opposed to humanizing and liberalizing the social and political institutions. These lessons from Communist practice should be kept in constant view by countries which aim at socialism, lest they should commit the same mistake.

Professor Tomasic's work is full of interest to scholars, politicians, ethical thinkers and the general reader.

P. T. RAJU

The Fourth Gospel and the Eighteenth Degree: A Correlation of Two Systems of Symbolism. By ARTHUR BROWN. (Rockliff Publishing Corporation, London. ix+177 pp. 1956. 21*s*.)

The author's intention in this book. which claims to be "the first comprehensive interpretation of the Rose Croix ceremony ever to be published," is to expound the ritual of the Eighteenth Degree in terms of the symbolism of St. John's Gospel.

He states: "This book is not in any sense official: it carries no authority other than that of its author." His approach lies strictly within the limits of Christian theology. The parallels from other more ancient religions, Eastern and Western, considered by most scholars interested in Freemasonry, he judges to be far-fetched and of little value. "A professing Christian will view all these matters with extreme reserve, and will be quite justified in regarding them as unworthy of his attention." His Preamble indicates the different Masonic degrees and rites, and his own standpoint with regard to the Fourth Gospel. The symbolism of the latter is then analyzed, with diligence and detail, under the headings "The Word," "I Am," "Light and Life," "The Law and the Prophets," "The Passover," "The Veil and the Stone," "The Hour," "Faith, Hope and Charity" and "Sundry Themes." An additional six-page Index, of references (verse by verse) to the Fourth Gospel, concludes the book.

E. W.

Freemasons' Book of the Royal Arch. By BERNARD E. JONES. (George G. Harrap and Company, Ltd., London. 294 pp. 31 half-tone plates and line illustrations. 1957. 27*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Jones's *Freemasons' Guide and Compendium* quickly established itself as an invaluable work of reference. This he has followed up by the volume under review where the clearness, tolerance, and inclusiveness shown in the earlier volume find equal scope.

The Royal Arch made and still makes a special appeal to its members by reason of the high and holy matters with which it deals, and of the sublimity and universality of its teachings and its ceremonial. And this in spite of inconsistencies, anachronisms, and much uncertainty — at any rate in detail — regarding its origin and development.

Of these points Mr. Jones is obviously well aware and in a passage on page 114 with characteristic clearness and frankness he well says:—

> The crowning anomaly in the history of the Royal Arch, which is a series of anomalies, is the one implicit in the declaration of 1817 that Royal Arch masonry does not constitute a degree. It is said that the 'Moderns' Brethren were most favourably disposed to the preservation in its entirety of the Royal Arch Degree. As *Brethren* no doubt many were, but it is a curious reflection that there must still at that late date have been an amount of official opposition to complete recognition, for otherwise the Royal Arch would have kept its pre-Union status of a full degree. Nominally it failed to do that, although in effect it remains a degree, as it always was and always will be for we must ever remember that a degree is but a step and that nobody can question that the Candidate in an Exaltation ceremony takes a step of high masonic importance.

Mr. Jones in his historical chapters deals as competently and clearly as the somewhat difficult circumstances permit with the not too easily digestible evidence of the origin and development of the degree, setting these out with completeness, with discretion, and without dogmatism. After the historical portion he discusses, among other matters, the Ritual, the Royal Arch in Ireland and in Scotland, the Symbols, the Furniture of the Chapter and the Clothing of the Companions. Many readers will find of particular interest the account of the summary by Photeus of the Ecclesiastical History of Philostorgius and of the recently discovered Inquisition documents on the Examination of Coustos.

The book is to be strongly recommended not only for the qualities already discussed but also for the number, interest, and appositeness of its illustrations.

LEWIS EDWARDS

Zimbabwe Cavalcade. Rhodesia's Romance. By B. G. PAVER. Foreword by ROY WELENSKY. (Cassell and Co., Ltd., London. xiii+217 pp. Illustrated. First published by Central News Agency, Ltd., South Africa, 1950: revised and republished in England, 1957. 18*s.*)

For years the Zimbabwe ruins have been the subject of mystery and controversy. Some have claimed that they were built when King Solomon ruled Israel, about 950 B.C., and that the smiling land of Southern Rhodesia was Ophir, whence came the gold, ivory, apes and peacocks, that the navies of Tharshish and Hiram brought to Ezion-Geber. Others have thought that they were built by native Africans — probably Bantu — not earlier than 900 A.D. The latest chemical tests suggest that the timber used in the construction is near 500 B.C.

Mr. Paver brings these, and many other interesting theories, together in his fascinating book. He adds no theory of his own, and writes about most of the others without bias; although it must be noted that he betrays his aversion to the idea that Zimbabwe's origin might possibly belong to the black, rather than to the white or brown, civilizations.

He falls into the common fault of berating the Bantu for their tribal wars, claiming that all that has been changed by the "superior" whites — omitting any mention of their tribal wars, now to be fought with hydrogen bombs.

In other words, Mr. Paver has not the spirit of the true anthropologist. His is an archæological approach; and he is at his best when dealing with stones and ancient manuscripts rather than with human beings.

DENNIS GRAY STOLL

Spinoza: The Road to Inner Freedom. Edited with an Introduction by DAGOBERT D. RUNES. (Philosophical Library, New York. 195 pp. $3.00)

Baruch Spinoza (1632-77) has been one of the most impressive philosophers of the West. He was a lonely and pathetic figure among the thinkers of his time. His family had to leave Spain on account of the Spanish Inquisition and seek refuge in Amsterdam. Owing to his unorthodox views, he was even excommunicated by his own brethren, the Jews.

Perhaps no philosopher has had such a contradictory assessment of his work as Spinoza. By some he was hailed as a God-intoxicated man, by others he was run down as a hideous atheist. It was only after a century or so, when sectarian prejudices had worn away, that his greatness as a thinker was recognized. By the end of the eighteenth century, he became a symbol of spiritual sanctity and intellectual integrity. Goethe, Lessing and Hegel were eloquent about him, and his thought has influenced the foremost thinkers of the world from Leibnitz to Einstein.

To him philosophy was not simply a way of thought but also a way of life, and he very aptly designated his metaphysics as ethics—the Road to Inner Freedom. In this book, he tackles the problems of the all-inclusiveness and the unity of God and the salvation of man.

According to Spinoza, man's salvation consists in being like God and his bondage in being unlike Him. In emotions and passions, we are personal. Only as we are purely rational are we purely active. We must overcome passion by reason, and live *sub specie æternitatis* (under a form of eternity). Eternity is a quality of being. It has no reference to time.

Spinoza advocated what he called the rational or spiritual love of God. Only thus can a man break the shackles of his animalhood.

Spinoza couched his ideas in mathematical formulæ and scholastic terminology. This makes his work difficult reading for the average man. Dr. Runes has done a distinct service to students of philosophy in expressing Spinoza's ideas in simple English, stripped of the scholastic and Euclidean method. The brief Introduction is helpful in understanding the tradition in which he was reared and the special contribution which he made to philosophy.

JAIDEVA SINGH

The Mind Goes Forth. The Drama of Understanding. By HARRY and BONARO OVERSTREET. (Peter Davies, Ltd., London. 350 pp. 1957. 21*s*.)

This book is written in the best American humanist tradition, warm, humane, and with a special faculty for finding new human relationships between people, without mention of the usual religious background. It is full of anecdotes with point and meaning and it extracts from current literature quotations to illustrate ideas that place the reader in touch with a current culture full of kindliness and purpose. It can be said that the authors, husband

and wife, radiate through their own harmony and achievement a social attitude that can help others.

The intention of the book is to find spiritual space for persons to live in, through groups, institutions and nations, and between persons themselves. Many people are cornered; we are frequently engaged in cornering ourselves and other people. We live upon our own egos because we do not know how to grant "space" to ourselves and our neighbours near and far. The authors offer wise suggestions for creating space and they regard this act as a new worthwhile drama of existence.

The book is not a sociological treatise; it is not "profound"; it has the gift of transmitting a kindliness of knowledge on the level of what had better be called the general reader. Its suggestions and insights would add much to the purpose of living for many people.

E. G. LEE

LEAVES FROM A PARIS DIARY

[HAVING ENJOYED a particularly fine performance by Monique Drouin and her Marionette Theatre, **Shri Baldoon Dhingra** surveys the puppet theatre and its social uses; and as usual his thoughts turn to what use could be made of this merry art for the Indians at home in village or town. — ED.]

Puppets are universal. In India the *sutradhara* or "manipulator of strings" is to be found in most classical plays. In some countries the puppet theatre becomes an important part of the dramatic scene. Puppetry exhibits a remarkable diversity all over the world. The Greek mechanician, Hero of Alexandria, had a complete automatic theatre. Shadow-puppets were known in ancient China and are still popular. In Java the shadow-play became the basis of theatrical art. In Europe during the heyday of the Italian Comedia dell'arte, there was free interchange between puppet and human actors. Some commedia characters like Punchinello and Harlequin still fascinate us today. Japanese drama, including the Kabuki, was strongly influenced by puppets. At one time, around 1760, the Japanese puppet theatre outstripped any other in richness. Human actors watched the puppets to learn the niceties of acting. Certain scenic devices, such as the revolving stage, first used in the puppet theatre, found their way into the Kabuki, and thence into other parts of the world. Puppet plays were written by the great Japanese dramatist Chikamatsu, who found greater freedom in writing for inanimate actors.

In Europe there are national puppet characters like Punch, Petrouschka and Guignol. And there are theatres of chivalric romance in France and Italy where the legends of Charlemagne and Roland are still enacted. There have also been puppet theatres of a more sophisticated type where artists and musicians have collaborated to produce shows for special audiences. One may recall the Théâtre des Ames at George Sand's home, "Nokant," in which she and her son Maurice wrote and produced witty and satirical hand-puppet plays for the delectation of their literary friends. There are many others in France: the Petit Théâtre (1888) of Henri Signoret where they produced Shakespeare and Cervantes, and the Chat Noir where Henri Rivière's shadows became famous. Paris has ever been a great city for the glove and marionette theatre. Today there are a dozen little marionette theatres all over this beautiful city. The Luxembourg gardens, the Salle Pleyel, the Tuileries,

all have their little theatres, and there are others. There is, for instance, Temporal's Theatre School, which is also a marvellous puppet museum.

At Unesco House the other day a large audience was bewitched by Monique Drouin and her Marionette Theatre. Monique Drouin is a very talented artist who uses her own creations to enchant and instruct her audiences. She and her little group gave a great performance at Unesco House to the immense delight of the children from six to sixty. The programme consisted of the *Life of Marie Curie* by Geraldine Gerard, Oscar Wilde's *Salome, L'Escalier* by Jules Supervielle and my *Le Collier d'Etoiles*. Monique Drouin's little marionette show was pure enchantment. It had also considerable educative value. I have on many occasions spoken about the importance of the puppet theatre in education.

There are some countries where the puppets are being used for educational purposes. In Mexico, for instance, the Ministry of Education has a puppetry programme for mass education of the people. Shows are sent to various schools and villages. The puppets dramatize the advantages of reading and writing, of brushing one's teeth and of taking daily exercise. Marjorie Butcholder has many stories to tell. In one show, she says, a little boy who refuses to have his hair cut jumps out of his unkempt hair and dirty mop; in another, a puppet announces that he is no friend to anybody who refuses to accept a toothbrush, whereupon everybody lines up for the show. The puppet succeeded where previous attempts to interest the children in toothbrushes had failed.

I have always felt we need two itinerant marionette theatres in India: one for the village and one for the town. Special plays on basic and fundamental education, with the villagers as protagonists or classical figures as heroes, should be performed. Plays should be written for them and these marionette theatres should tour from village to village with plays both serious and comic to delight and edify. The plays would need to be specially adapted to suit village needs. Puppets could be used for literacy classes, for exercises, for teaching hygiene and other educative purposes. I do wish some enterprising theatre lovers would use the indigenous marionette theatre to useful purposes. Shrimati Charat Ram of New Delhi is already taking some interest in this field, and some experiments were made in Mysore in recent years. I do hope she can use the dramatic talent which is not lacking in India to develop this great art, which has greater possibilities than one realizes. Indeed, it may even invigorate our decadent and decaying theatre.

BALDOON DHINGRA

All service ranks the same with God—
With God, whose puppets, best and worst,
Are we; there is no last nor first.

—ROBERT BROWNING

THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF WORLD CULTURE

[BELOW we print a paper read on December 14th last at the Institute, written by **Professor Pearl Cleveland Wilson, Ph.D.,** of the Classics Department of Hunter College. Professor Wilson grew up in a family where music and literature were constant interests, and she studied both piano and cello. Her specializing in ancient Greek began in high school, was continued at Vassar College, and later at Columbia University, where she received the degree of PH.D., for which the subject of her dissertation (published by the Columbia University Press) was *Wagner's Dramas and Greek Tragedy*. She has been teaching the ancient Greek language and literature at Hunter College from 1925 on, and since 1953 as Professor Emeritus.— ED.]

THE GREEK WAY OF LIFE

Any complete presentation of the Greek way of life would fill more than one volume. Living on the eastern shore of Greece and the western coast of Asia Minor as well as on the islands between, the ancient Greeks spoke the same language, but in widely differing dialects. Each so-called city had a population smaller than many towns have today. But one city, with some surrounding farm and grazing land, and perhaps a few villages, constituted a nation—politically independent, ready to fight and die rather than live on without that cherished independence. The people were strongly individualistic, with keen, searching minds. They had also an extraordinary sensitiveness to beauty and the capacity to embody it in literature, in art, and even in the simple utensils handled every day in their homes.

In calling attention to some out of the many contributions of lasting value which the ancient Greeks left to our modern world, we shall do well to avoid comparisons. It was not their habit to point out defects or failures of others in order to magnify their own achievements. Indeed it would appear that their characteristic and intense love of freedom was rooted in a kind of acknowledgment, sensed even though not fully reasoned, that as there is one heritage for all humanity, so are there unlimited possibilities for individual development.

Save for epic and lyric poetry, the greatest Greek literature—embracing tragedy, comedy, history and philosophy—was all produced in Athens, and during the 5th and 4th centuries before Christ. At the beginning of the 5th century Athens reached her highest point as a democracy. In describing practices, both in daily life and in government, that had produced her greatness, the historian Thucydides says:—

> In private disputes the law secures equal justice to all. But in the matter of individual excellence, whenever a man is seen to have ability, he is advanced in public service, not with reference to class or party, but in accordance with his own merit. Poverty is no hindrance. The ability to benefit his country is all that matters. In public life there is no exclusiveness, and in the ordering of his personal affairs a man is free to differ from his neighbours without being criticized or disliked.

Sir Alfred Zimmern, holder of the first professorship of International Relations at Oxford, says of the years from 480 to 430 B.C. in Athens:—

> For a whole wonderful half-century, the richest and happiest period in the recorded history of any community, Politics and Morality, the deepest and strongest forces of national and of individual life, had moved forward hand in hand towards a common ideal, the perfect citizen in the perfect state. All the high things in human life seemed to lie along that road: "Freedom, Law, and Progress; Truth and Beauty; Knowledge

and Virtue; Humanity and Religion."

This was the inspiring result of the dynamic clash of ideas made possible for Athenians by their cherished right of *parrêsia*. The word is a compound of *pas*, all, and *rêsis*, saying; and they exercised this right of saying everything they thought to an extent that has, perhaps, never been equalled since. They met and talked every day in the market place and the porticoes, in the grounds where young athletes were exercising, in the law courts, that were kept busy by their disputes, and at meetings of the national assembly, in which, because of the small size of their country, every citizen was a member.

On procedure in this assembly Thucydides comments:—

> We come to a decision in the right way, as the result of profound thinking and careful discrimination. We do not consider discussion an impediment to action. The dangerous thing is not to gain knowledge by discussion before undertaking a necessary task.

The Greek habit of clear thinking led naturally to a recognition that there is something to be said on both sides of a question as a rule, and they were always eager to listen while arguments were presented, or—better still—to participate in the discussion. Euripides in many of his plays has a scene where each of two conflicting characters delivers a speech presenting the relevant facts in logical order, in a manner intellectual rather than emotional. These opposing speeches are of equal length, reminding one of the Athenian courts, where the same time was granted to plaintiff and defendant by the use of a water-clock. Though Euripides could infuse emotional scenes with power and sometimes violence, that have never been exceeded, he evidently chose this way of presenting facts underlying the dramatic situation in order to achieve such clarity that no one in the audience could fail to keep them in mind.

The greatest literary use of discussion to reach or at least approximate truth is unquestionably found in the dialogues of Plato. There differing views are freely presented, examined under the clear light of reason, and when they fail to stand the test, discarded in whole or in part, as understanding may direct. The dramatic character of the dialogue form implies an audience—the reader. When the participants in the dialogue do not arrive at a conclusion, it is because Plato intends to offer the reader an opportunity, the value of which can never be overestimated. With the material that has been given, or definitely suggested, the reader can in the "solitary travail of his mind and soul" discover the answer. Only so does one gain what Plato considered true knowledge.

The Greeks not merely granted an opponent's right to hold and to present his own views; they refrained from sweeping condemnation of those who were opponents. This appears first in the earliest work of European literature —Homer's *Iliad*. The eminent Oriental scholar, W. F. Albright, not long ago gave the date of its composition as prior to 950 B.C., and it is possible that the study of Cretan inscriptions, now being made as a result of their decipherment by Michael Ventris, may lead to placing it still earlier.

In the *Iliad* the Trojans are the enemies of the Greeks, yet the poet shows many a fine character among them. As a nation they have done wrong in supporting the outrage committed by the young prince, Paris. Hospitality was held by the ancient Greeks to be an absolute duty, enjoined by their highest god. Any crime, even any minor offense, became far worse when committed against a host or a guest. In the sixth book of the *Iliad*, two warriors about to contend make the discovery that in a previous generation there was hospitality between

their families. Each then gives the other a piece of his own armour as a present, and they separate to seek opponents in some other part of the battlefield. When Paris won the love of Helen, his host's wife, and brought her to Troy, he violated the sacred rights of hospitality. And when the Greek army offered to withdraw without fighting, if she should be restored to her husband, the Trojans brought war—and ultimate destruction—upon themselves by refusing to give her up. Yet the character of Hector, averse to war himself and bearing the heavy responsibility of Troy's defence, wins admiration and sympathy. He is the leader of the enemy, but his qualities as a human being outweigh in significance the circumstances of his environment.

A similar attitude towards the enemy in war is found in the opening sentence of the first great work of Greek prose literature. Herodotus, often called "the father of history," wrote about the wars in which two successive monarchs tried to overwhelm the Greeks and make them permanently subject to the far-spreading Persian despotism. He believed—and with this later historians have agreed—that the loss of Greek independence at this time would have put a stop to the intellectual development which immediately after these wars reached its culmination in Greek drama and Greek philosophy. Before quoting the opening sentence of Herodotus, one should explain that the original meaning of "barbarian" was simply "a person who speaks a language other than Greek." Herodotus uses the word as a synonym for "Persian" and with no necessarily derogatory connotation. His history begins:—

> Herodotus of Halicarnassus has written this account in order that the great deeds both of Greeks and of barbarians may not pass from the memory of man or fail to receive the honour they deserve.

We notice that Herodotus recognizes personal greatness in action on both sides.

The readiness of Athenians to admire a national enemy sometimes went to an absurd extreme in the case of persons lacking good judgment. The most powerful and persistent enemy of Athens among the Greek cities was Sparta. For nearly thirty years, with occasional brief intervals, the Spartans were trying to overthrow the supremacy and the prestige of Athens in the deplorable struggle known as the Peloponnesian War. Yet in the middle of that period the number of Athenians who proudly imitated Spartan dress and Spartan customs was large enough for Aristophanes, in one of his comedies, to use their affectation of austerity and hardihood as a springboard for his brilliant wit. It is significant, however, that these imitators aroused merely the laughter, not the suspicion of their fellow Athenians.

Recognition, then, of admirable qualities in foe as well as friend appears among the Greeks from the earliest times, even as it does in ancient India, a notable example of which is the *Bhagavad Gita*, indicating the close kinship in philosophic thought between these two peoples. In Athens we find insistence on the rights of the individual and free discussion. Both of these would mark progress towards a sense of brotherhood, but in the western world the first statement definitely implying the brotherhood of man that was made by one who was not a philosopher has been attributed to Alexander the Great.

The widely accepted belief that his chief purpose was conquest has been disproved in the scholarly two-volume work, entitled *Alexander the Great*, by W. W. Tarn of Cambridge University. Alexander's military ability was indeed remarkable, but it was not the cause of his true greatness, nor could it ever have encompassed his highest aim.

In a letter that Alexander, shortly

after crossing to Asia, sent to his teacher, Aristotle, he wrote: "I should rather excel in my acquaintance and experience with the finest things than in my power." He was in the habit of saying that he admired Aristotle profoundly, and loved him no less than his father, for he had received life from his father, but from Aristotle the knowledge of what constitutes a noble life. He took with him Aristotle's edition of the *Iliad* when he set out on his Asiatic expedition and kept it under his pillow at night. Finding that he could get no more books in Asia after he had proceeded inland, he ordered others brought to him from Greece, and among them were the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides.

On crossing to Asia he went first to the hill of Troy. He found only an insignificant settlement on the famous site, but he performed a sacrifice in the temple of Athena, and laid a wreath on what was believed to be the tomb of Achilles. Then—and this is more important—he commanded that Troy should rise again from its ruins to become a favoured city and be granted freedom from taxation and the right of self-government. In other words, the first act of this leader who came representing all Greece was to revive the city destroyed by Greece centuries before.

His victory over a Persian army was soon followed by the voluntary surrender of Lydia. It had been conquered by the Persians and held in subjection for two hundred years. Alexander freed the Lydians and restored their ancient constitution of which the Persians had robbed them. Many Greek cities in Asia that had been under the domination of the Persian empire he made independent states, and released them from the payment of tribute, whereupon they became his free allies.

That his expedition was undertaken not so much for conquest as for exploration is indicated by various facts. He took with him geographers, botanists and other scientific men, who collected information and specimens for Aristotle. One of his desires—and Aristotle's as well—was to determine the geographical relation of India[1] to Egypt on the west and to the remote "ocean" on the east. The powerful rajah of Taxila (located on the Indus river) offered aid to Alexander, prompted partly by his own difficulties with the Paurava king, Porus. In Taxila (excavated in the early years of the present century) Alexander saw for the first time a great Indian city. It was a commercial centre and a famous university town, headquarters of the teaching of the *Brahmans*. Porus was conquered in battle by Alexander, who then accepted him as an ally, established him as a protected native ruler, brought about a reconciliation between him and the rajah of Taxila, and enlarged the kingdoms of both. When Alexander left India he handed over to Porus the eastern Panjab. Though it had cost him hard fighting he abandoned it in order to turn his efforts to exploration. At the time of his death he was planning to explore the coast of Arabia and also the Caspian Sea.

Philosophers and men of letters, as well as scientists, were among those who accompanied Alexander from Greece. In India, after an encounter with the warlike Malli, ten of the so-called "naked wise men" were captured. Because of their reputation for giving clever, concise answers, Alexander questioned them for some time, afterward sending them away with gifts. It was the rajah of Taxila who persuaded a noted Indian philosopher to visit Alexander. Plutarch tells us that his real name was Sphines, but the Greeks called him

[1] "India" to Alexander and his historians meant nothing beyond the region bordering the Indus river.

Kalanos because when greeting anyone he used the word *kale* instead of the customary Greek salutation. He is reported to have given Alexander advice about governing, using as an illustration a dry and shrivelled hide. He threw it on the ground, and set his foot successively on different spots along the outer edge, showing that as he pressed it down in one place, it rose up in others. But when he stood in the middle, it was held down everywhere, flat and firm.

The Egyptians, after Alexander had freed them from Persian rule, crowned him as Pharaoh. He then went to their famous oracle of Ammon, and was greeted by the priest as Ammon's son. People have wrongly interpreted this as proof that Alexander wanted to be looked upon as divine. The truth is, however, that this was the customary way of addressing every Pharaoh. He entered the inner shrine with the priest, but what happened there he never disclosed though it was evident that he had been deeply impressed. (The so-called "deification" of Alexander by the League of Corinth is explained by Tarn as a political measure with no religious import for anyone concerned.)

While Alexander was in Egypt, he listened to the teaching of Psammon, readily accepting that philosopher's statement that all human beings are under the kingship of God, because in each person that which rules and masters is divine. To this Alexander is said by Plutarch to have added that the father of all mankind is God — it is noteworthy that he does not say *Zeus* or *Ammon* — and the best among men He makes peculiarly His own.

In breadth of view Alexander went beyond his celebrated teacher. Aristotle had advised him to behave to Greeks as a leader, to barbarians as a master, treating the Greeks as friends and relatives, the others as animals and plants. But Alexander declared that the real distinction between men did not depend upon race, only on whether they were good or bad, and that both were to be found in every race. He believed that he had been sent by God to establish harmony and be "the reconciler of the world, bringing men from everywhere into a unity."

The culminating point of Alexander's career, Tarn believes, was reached at Opis on the Tigris river, when he gave an extraordinary banquet — traditionally to nine thousand people — to emphasize that the world was now at peace. At the end of the banquet the guests made a libation together, and after that Alexander prayed that there might be *homonoia* (together-mindedness) for all men, and that the various races might live peacefully, side by side, in fellowship. This concept is based on an attitude of mind to be independently reached and voluntarily maintained. It is different from an organized state, such as the Roman Empire. Unfortunately Alexander died the next year, at the age of thirty-three.

Except in accounts of Alexander's expedition, India is almost never mentioned in classical Greek literature. Aeschylus, in his earliest extant drama, *The Suppliant Maidens,* makes the Greek king say he has heard of wandering Indian maidens who ride on camels. Herodotus, when giving a list of the tributes collected by the Persian king from the different parts of his empire, says that the Indians, being more numerous than the people of any other nation, paid the largest amount — 360 talents of gold dust. He describes the manner of collecting this, and then tells of trees that grow wild in India and produce a kind of wool which the natives use in making garments. This evidently refers to cotton, and Herodotus says it is finer and more beautiful than the wool obtained from sheep. He also mentions a group of Indians who eat only vegetables and will never kill any animal.

The earliest medical school in Europe about which we have definite informa-

tion — as early perhaps as the 7th century B.C. — was located in a Spartan colony in Asia Minor, and is believed "to have drawn on Indian as well as Persian medicine." Cardamon and sesame seed were brought into Greece, and in Athens they were used in food and also as drugs. This seems to have been the extent of Greek knowledge of India before Alexander.

Egypt, however, was known from the earliest times. Excavations have proved its active relations with Crete, where the first flowering of Minoan culture (before 2,000 B.C.) seems to have been the result of Egyptian impetus. In Cretan art we often find the Egyptian *ankh* — a symbol of life — and also the sistrum, which was used especially in the worship of Isis. But it is significant that they have been incorporated in an art pervaded by its own individual spirit, of which lively action and brilliant imagination are characteristic.

Up to this point our concern has been mainly with historical facts and we must not turn away from them without considering the tragic annihilation of what had made Athens, for approximately half of the 5th century B.C., a centre of inspiring life, best described by the words of Zimmern previously quoted.

In 431 B.C., the disastrous Peloponnesian War began. The eminent and highly critical historian, Thucydides, states his belief that the real cause of the War — though never admitted — was Sparta's jealousy of the growing power and honour won by Athens. The forces that urged Sparta into war, he said, had more to do with feeling than with facts. It was a question of prestige in the Greek world, not of trade or wealth. The next year plague fell upon Athens. It continued to rage for two years, adding its toll to that exacted by war. More than one quarter of the population died, among them the great Pericles, who had directed the nation's growth for thirty years, continually reelected because of his ability and integrity. Dead thereafter, as Zimmern says, was the spirit that had made Athens great. Gone was her habit of thinking quietly and steadily, her self-discipline and reverence, her hope and joy. They had been replaced by greed and suspicion, envy and despair.

The *Oedipus Rex* of Sophocles appears to have been produced in the spring of 429 B.C. That was after the plague had struck Athens but before it had been robbed of Pericles. On this tragedy, which Aristotle praised as a model of plot construction, new light has recently been thrown by Bernard Knox of Yale University. The virtues and the faults of Oedipus, he says, are identical with those of the Athenian democracy. Both showed intelligence, versatility and capacity for swift and courageous action. But both also had tremendous self-confidence, which could pass the bounds of reason and mislead, causing furious anger and destruction.

The play of Sophocles shows the fall of a man of heroic capacities from the highest position in the land. He had unhesitatingly accepted the responsibilities of leadership without first applying the ancient Greek maxim: "Know thyself." In a single day this knowledge is forced upon him, and the king who had been revered almost as a god becomes a man so defiled by his own ignorant acts that even the lowest subject in his realm draws away, revolted.

This powerful drama was written when Athens, still assured and unafraid, looked down upon the world from a height no other state had reached, failing to see the precipice at her own feet. Some persons realized that she had been approaching it, and the most important of them was Socrates. Before the Peloponnesian War he had begun the effort to which half of the seventy years of his life were devoted. This was an effort to make the Athenians aware of the danger into which they were blindly hastening — the danger of seeking by superficial cleverness to make an im-

pression, or to get their own way, instead of continuing their earlier search for knowledge, their endeavour to come nearer to Absolute Truth. His selfless devotion to a noble attempt did not save Athens from plunging into political disaster, but its deeply moving appeal to the young Plato resulted, after Socrates died, in the writing of works that have stimulated thought for more than two thousand years and are still a source of inspiration.

Greek religious and philosophic thought is a subject too broad and too varied for examination here. But a few significant facts may be noted. The well-known multitude of anthropomorphic divinities seems to have sprung from a simple, yet profound, early belief that everything in nature had a life and a power of its own. The worship of a river that overflowed its banks after winter rains and made the adjacent land more fertile than that beyond the reach of its waters soon became the worship of a river god, whose name was identical with that of the stream. The vivid personalizing imagination of the Greeks conceived the god as a being similar to themselves, but more powerful and more mysterious. After that it was a short step to seeing any destruction the river might bring about as the result of anger, and to conjecturing as to what might have caused it. Herodotus says that the poets Homer and Hesiod made a genealogy of gods for the Greeks and gave them descriptive epithets, distinguishing their individual honours and skills, and describing their appearances.

The first great tragic poet, Aeschylus, had a more spiritual conception. In the *Agamemnon* his belief is impressively set forth:—

Zeus, whosoever he may be,
spirit almighty and divine,
if he is pleased that we should use this name,
so let him be called.

Weighing all perplexities
that baffle human lives,
I find no explanation, no solution,
save in Zeus alone.

Those others whom men in their blindness worshipped,
They have gone back into the darkness of ignorance
from which they sprang.
Intelligence is satisfied
only by Zeus.

For he alone has led mankind
to wisdom, even though the way
to it is often found only through suffering.

Waking or sleeping, willing or unwilling,
this is the road that we must travel
to reach the highest goal attainable by man—
wisdom, the highest, holiest blessing granted to mankind.

A quotation from his play, *Daughters of the Sun,* unfortunately lost, has come down to us:—

Zeus is air, Zeus is earth, Zeus is sky,
Zeus is indeed all things, and whatever is beyond all.

Plato, in the *Timaeus,* where the speaker is not Socrates but a Pythagorean philosopher, gives a detailed account of the creation of the heavenly bodies and of animal life. The following quotations are from Jowett's summary in the Introduction to his translation of the *Timaeus*:—

First, I must distinguish between being which has no becoming and is apprehended by reason and reflection, and endless becoming which has no being, and is conceived by opinion with the help of sense. All that becomes and is created is the work of a cause, and that is fair which the artificer makes after an eternal pattern, and that which is fashioned after a created pattern is not fair.

In the variety of opinions which have arisen about God and the nature of the world we must be content to take probability for our guide, considering that I who am the speaker, and you who are the judges are only men, and to probability we may attain but no further.

The head is the god and lord of us. To this the body was given "to be a vehicle, and the members to be instruments. . . . In the next place, the gods gave a forward motion to the human body, because the front part of man was more honorable and had authority. In this front part they inserted organs to minister in all things to the provi-

dence of soul. They first contrived the eye, into which they conveyed the gentle light of everyday life, making the fire which is within us to flow pure through the pupil of the eye and meet the light of day. When the light of the eye is surrounded by the light of day, then like falls upon like, and there is a union of them formed in any direction in which the visual strikes upon the light coming from an object. And as like is affected by like, whatever touches or is touched by the stream of vision, is diffused over the whole body and finds a way into the soul. But when the visual ray goes forth into darkness, then like falls upon unlike—the eye no longer sees, and we go to sleep. The fire, or light which is kept in, equalizes the inward motions, and there is rest.

Hesiod, who was later than Homer, but of uncertain date, gives (in the course of a long poem entitled *Works and Days*) an account of "the five ages of the world":—

First, he says, came the golden race, subjects of Cronus, the father of Zeus. Their life was happy — free from work or care, or any encroachment of old age. They lived on milk, wild fruit and honey. Death was no more terrible to them than sleep, and their spirits still survive, giving good fortune and maintaining justice.

A silver race followed, also divinely created, which practised agriculture and ate bread. Their society was matriarchal, and they were ignorant and quarrelsome. They did not make war on one another but they failed to worship the gods, and so were destroyed by Zeus.

The third race delighted in war and had bronze weapons. They ate meat as well as bread. To this race belonged the earliest Hellenic invaders of the Greek peninsula. Insolent and pitiless, they were all "seized by black death."

The fourth race also used bronze, but its men were more generous and nobler, being the children of gods, but having mortal mothers. Among them were the heroes who fought at Troy and at Thebes, and those who went on the expedition of the Argonauts. After death they dwelt in the Elysian Fields.

The fifth race, Hesiod declared, were the men of his own "iron age," unworthy descendants of the fourth race. They were unjust, cruel and libidinous. Malice and treachery were common among them.

Much could be added to indicate the expanding of Greek openmindedness towards an acknowledgment of human brotherhood, and still more to show the impulse that drove the Greeks forward with unflagging eagerness to leap each barrier, as they strove towards further knowledge. No one has represented the latter with more poetic truth than Euripides in his *Medea*. The hunger of the Athenians, he says in a famous choral ode, is for high and glorious wisdom. Here in their city, the sacred Nine — the Muses, who hold all poetry, all art, all music and all knowledge in their creative hands — have met and united to make one everlasting, shining harmony, while Love, the goddess, brings all the mighty ardour she commands to Wisdom's side to help in every noble work.

Wisdom's triumph over passion and ignorance is portrayed with unsurpassable grandeur in the concluding scene of the greatest of the dramas of Aeschylus, the *Oresteia*. Athena, the goddess in whom wisdom is personified, faces the utterly hostile and wildly vindictive Furies. They are primitive and powerful beings who sprang from earth, long before gods came into existence, to be relentless avengers of crime, especially when it was committed against a blood relation. Neither in this world nor in the next have their victims been able to escape the torture they inflict.

Orestes, who shrank with horror from the thought of murdering, had been commanded by Apollo to conform to the custom of the time and kill his father's murderer, although that murderer was his mother. Against all the promptings of his nature and revolted by the act as he performs it, he obeys the god. But no effort of Apollo avails to make the Furies recognize that the

man who had acted against his will, but by a god's command, did not deserve the agonies that they inflicted. Impatient at their blindness, Apollo drove them from his temple and sent Orestes to seek Athena's aid. Nothing less than absolute Wisdom could solve the problem.

Athena meets them with a different manner. She knows their actions have been prompted by abhorrence of crime. That should range them on the side of justice and righteousness. Because they have seen only the act and ignored the cause they have been straying from true justice. She resolves to draw them into union with it by a broadening of understanding.

Under her direction a court is established in her city of Athens, where hereafter a trial shall be held for every case of murder. No longer shall it be a kinsman's duty to avenge one crime by the commission of another.

By the decision of Athenian citizens and of their goddess, Orestes is again released. The Furies are defeated, but they are not convinced. Athena's aim to waken in them higher perceptions has not yet been achieved. They curse her city, where their striving for justice — as they saw it — has been thwarted.

Even at that, Athena, unlike Apollo, is not angry or impatient. She could destroy the Furies who so stubbornly persist in remaining enemies. To her alone among the gods Zeus has entrusted the key to that strong door behind which all his thunderbolts are locked. She could release them and annihilate the Furies. But this she will not do. She chooses to persuade them. However long the time it will require, she declares, she will never grow weary in her effort to make them gain an understanding of what is truly good.

The final reconciliation rises to a height lofty beyond the reach of any describing words. Aeschylus believed — and leads us to realize — that the errors and the blindness of opponents should not make us try to bring about their destruction. We should search — and never weary in the effort — to make them see and then cast off their errors. After that, all that had been good in their aims, no longer hampered by misconceptions, may be united with what is good in ours. Together we can then go forward to a higher goal.

PEARL CLEVELAND WILSON

Books mentioned:

Zimmern, Alfred — *The Greek Commonwealth* (Oxford University Press).

Knox, Bernard M. W. — *Oedipus at Thebes* (Yale University Press).

Tarn, W. W. — *Alexander the Great* (Cambridge University Press).

Tarn's authorities for the incidents mentioned in this paper are: Plutarch, *Life of Alexander*, also *De Alexandri Fortuna*; a fragment of Eratosthenes (head of the Alexandrian Library); Arrian, *Anabasis*, a history of Alexander based on an account by Ptolemy (son of Lagus), who served as general under Alexander on his expedition and had access to the *Journal* recording events as they occurred.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"————————ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers."
HUDIBRAS

Scarcity of food prevails in India. It is a headache to ministers of State and to high-salaried officials, but they do not actually suffer from food privation. The poor masses, always half-starved, are feeling the acute pinch of greater hunger, which the Compassionate Sage, Gautama the Buddha, described as "the worst of diseases" (*Dhammapada,* v. 203). Unphilosophical politicians, speculative philosophers and impractical scientists trace the cause of famine conditions wrongly. Modern science does not know that a Moral Law is at work in the universe; modern philosophers are not able to use their speculations practically and to come to grips with this physical-plane problem; the social servants of the politicians work with surface effects. Even the right distribution of millions of tons of Canadian wheat and other food gifts will not solve the problem, though a proper use of these may enable the Government to pull through a crisis.

Blind faith in the Second Five-Year Plan will not remove the root of our trouble. Unless people who occupy places of power in different spheres of action recognize the existence of the Moral Law and humbly learn the technique of its undeviating, infallible movements, they cannot but go round and round and the masses continue to suffer.

In the great book of which Indians speak with pride, the *Bhagavad-Gita,* there are important thoughts presented about food coming from rain and rain from sacrifice, *yagna.* Hindus, both orthodox and "reformed," do not know what *yagna* means, or the part that the individual plays in bringing about scarcity of food; and they will not learn till orthodoxy, rooted in priestcraft, is overcome. Priests of every creed are the enemies of the prophets, and the Hindu laymen fail to comprehend and practise the *Gita* teachings mainly because of the priests. There is practical philosophy in the *Gita,* Chapter III, verses 10-15. This verse also presents the truth in a simple, homely form:—

Back of the Bread is the Flour
And back of the Flour the Mill,
Back of the Mill is the Sun and the shower
And the Wind and the Father's Will.

The Union Language Convention of South India was held on December 22nd at Madras, and passed an outspoken resolution that English be retained as the official language of the Union and that the Constitution be amended to that effect. Some of the supporters of this resolution are elders and illustrious: among them Shri C. Rajagopalachari, Sir Mirza Ismail and Dr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar.

Scholars and statesmen have had misgivings from the first about the narrow-majority decision by which Hindi was named the official language. Sir Mirza made the fundamental point that "to make Hindi the official language, and even fix a date for this, is far too daring a challenge to the Time Spirit." Rajaji insisted upon a frank and free attitude: "My obligations to my party and friends are totally irrelevant to what I ought to think on a matter like this."

The Hindu of December 23rd reported at length the substantial and close reasoning at the Convention. The

basic facts are that the regional languages can accomplish culturally all that Hindi could; that neither they nor Hindi could do administratively, judicially or technologically what English can. It is only if and when these facts of social significance change that we should consider replacing English, not only as the language of administration but in the field of inward and cultural growth beyond the limits of what any of the regional tongues can open for any one. Till then to prefer English is patriotic and to call it "foreign" an irrelevant piece of sentimentality and historical short-sightedness. English is international, hence foreign to none.

But it is to be wished that the Convention does not remain only one of South India: its moral authority will deepen as it becomes an association of thoughtful Indians of all provinces.

The important role which a writer can play when rapid changes are taking place in society was ably brought out by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, in his address to the All-India Writers' Conference held in Calcutta late in December. Pointing out that no writer can afford to insulate himself in an ivory tower in the present atomic age, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan said:—

> Today, writers have a great function to perform. They have to portray the pathos, failures, disruption and self-betrayal of our country. We have corruption in high places, great economic distress, national differences, dissensions which divide us one from the other. If the literary artists are able to capture the atmosphere of the country and direct the attention of the people so as to remove these blemishes which make us ashamed of ourselves, if they do not participate in these disputes themselves, and they hold up the vision of India as a unity, and humanity as one, they would have done a great deal for this generation. This is my appeal to you.

Just as science is conquering all barriers of space and time, the element of communication in literature can also transcend all barriers which divide man from man. It is the duty of the writer to overcome the psychological and emotional barriers which still exist in the world, creating conflicts. And the Vice-President's advice to writers to rise above petty frictions and develop cultural solidarity and fellowship in the world is therefore very timely. He said:—

> The unity of the world cannot rest on political arrangements, economic alliances and social factors. It is possible only if you are able to produce a sense of psychological coherence, a sense of world community in the people themselves. Literature has a great part to play in engendering this consciousness that we all belong to one family.

Since the great achievements of science have not enabled man to regain his tranquillity but only tossed him into the turbulent waters of strife and conflict, it is hoped that writers, by playing their traditional role as guides and leaders, will be able to help him find some safe anchorage amidst the terrible insecurities of the present day.

Dr. Humayun Kabir in his address said that despite the conquest of time and space, a number of barriers still existed in the minds of human beings. He explained that *sahitya* was essentially the coming together of thought and emotion, or a meeting of minds in the common pursuit of beauty and truth.

The duty of the writer to himself and to the public is to be true to himself and not allow his mind and heart to be exploited by his government so that he will only write or paint or carve according to official orders. In all totalitarian States the creative artist is not free but slavishly accepts the instructions given. Indian writers must retain to the full their freedom of expression.

The great complexity of modern society, together with the unprecedented power which man has acquired over

material nature, has created a real crisis, the "crisis of character." Writers and thinkers, statesmen and administrators, are constantly referring to it. The latest ones to sound warnings are Dr. M. S. Aney, ex-Governor of Bihar, and Shri Patanjali Sastri, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India, both of whom were delivering Convocation Addresses to universities. While both dealt with the same theme and referred to the question of religion, the remedies suggested to resolve the issues were quite different.

According to reports, Shri Patanjali Sastri holds that

> the present "crisis of character" was "basically traceable to a cleavage in our thought-pattern marked by divergent conceptions of what was desirable living in our new democratic set-up and the consequent confusion in our life outlook."

He traced the conflict to the divergence that exists between the Western conceptions and norms adopted by India in the political and economic fields and India's age-long cultural traditions.

Dr. Aney, on the other hand, advocates imitation of the West in the field of religion and suggests the creation of a "Ministry of Religion" at the Centre. According to him:—

> ...such a Ministry will have special responsibility to create a machinery like the Ecclesiastical Department that shall cater to the religious needs and requirements of India professing and following different religions.

He wants the State to "create a class of preachers, priests and religious heads of the principal religions of India." They should have "the same status and salary as members of other Central Department services."

We believe that Dr. Aney's solution would certainly create several new problems and heighten the "crisis in character." This country is already cursed with religious superstition fostered by priestcraft, *mobeds* and *moulanas*, *padris* and *purohits*. An Ecclesiastical Department would spend money for itself and only enhance the spiritual slavery of citizens which now exists.

It is good to note, however, that both Shri Patanjali Sastri and Dr. M. S. Aney have rightly urged the need to cherish our heritage and keep alive the best that is in our cultural life and thought. As the former remarks:—

> Unless we adopt an objective mode of diagnosis, and search for the root cause of the malaise that besets our society, and, by appropriate treatment, bring about a change of spirit and life outlook, the brave new world which our founding fathers envisaged in our Constitution will recede like the horizon before our advance despite the economic progress we are planning.

Shri Sastri also pointed out that a "secular" State "did not and should not be taken to mean that our State stood for a system of ethics divorced from religion." And Dr. Aney on this point said:—

> Divorce between religion and morality is likely to result in the annihilation of both rather than the growth of either. Mere rationalism cannot take the place of religious faith as an instrument of character building of the masses of young children.

We agree. But what has brought about the divorce between religion and morality? Priestcraft which upholds creedalism; each organized religion keeping its followers busy, but disabling them for *living* the higher life. Organized religions and salaried priests divide the so-called sacred from the so-called secular. H. P. Blavatsky's advice is the real solution:—

> The world needs no sectarian church, whether of Buddha, Jesus, Mahomet, Swedenborg, Calvin, or any other. There being but ONE Truth, man requires but one church—the Temple of God within us, walled in by matter but penetrable by any one who can find the way; *the pure in heart see God.*

In her Christmas Message to the people of the Commonwealth Queen Elizabeth II makes clear that she sees the

present world crisis as caused by the wrong thinking and moral weakness of people, not by the "new inventions." *The Times of India* (December 26th) reports her as saying that unthinking people who discard ancient ideals, who would "have religion thrown aside, morality in personal and public life made meaningless, honesty counted as foolishness and self-interest set up in place of self-restraint," have caused the trouble.

Believing this, her appeal to remedy matters goes naturally to the hearts of her people:—

> At this critical moment in our history we need a special kind of courage . . . a kind which makes us stand up for everything that we know to be right, everything we know is honest . . . that can withstand the subtle corruption of the cynic.

The British are fortunate in having a Queen whose perception is so true and whose faith in humanity so strong that it makes her say: "I cannot lead you in battle . . . but I can give you my heart."

On January 1st, 1958, there opened a project, the European Common Market, that, according to the financial expert, Paul Bareau (*News Chronicle*, January 1st, 1958), promises to revolutionize the economic and probably the political history of the European Continent. It marks a turning point in the alternating swing between "tariff walls" and "free trade." Its aim is to create economic unity and a single market with free movement of capital and peoples between France, Western Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium and Luxemburg, and it is also visualized as a vital step towards a political federation of a United States of Europe. M. Bareau quotes M. Spaak on the underlying inspiration of the scheme:—

> Millions of Europeans now realize that two world wars which stained the Continent with blood, were actually civil wars; that victory of one side over another was at best a hollow one; that all the heroism and all the sacrifices solved nothing; and that if the inhabitants of this little promontory of Asia wish to survive and to conserve some of their past greatness they cannot continue to kill and maim each other. They must live together and prosper together, or perish.

Negotiations are proceeding also to associate Britain and ten other European countries with this European Common Market in a larger Free Trade Area, without quite the same political implications, since Britain, for example, has ties with the Commonwealth and North Atlantic countries.

M. Paul Bareau gives a side glance at the danger that greater united strength might produce, if misused, but is reasonably optimistic about the outcome. He calls it a tremendous adventure, a welcome counterbalance to the disillusionment, disappointment and doubt that too often cloud international relations. Again he quotes M. Spaak:—

> No one has been coerced. Our only arms have been the appeal to intelligence, reason, wisdom, human solidarity — plus the memory of our past greatness and our past mistakes. If we unite together we will have achieved it without shedding a drop of blood.

One can work for unity from below upwards or from above downwards, but, to enable this unity to withstand future cyclic swings, both actions must work as one. A fulcrum is the point against or on which a lever is placed to get purchase or support. The fulcrum of economic and political unity is the realization of spiritual unity among, not only Europeans, but all men. Pressure on that alone will give sure results.

HENRY DAVIS COMPANY
(Private) LIMITED

IMPORTERS

of

ATLAS PENCILS and LEADS

SCRIPTO MECHANICAL PENCILS

DOBBINS AGRICULTURAL SPRAYERS, Etc.

BOSTITCH STAPLING MACHINES and REFILLS

Enquiries Invited

Head Office:

18, ELPHINSTONE CIRCLE

BOMBAY 1

ROYAL & GENUINE PERFUME

MYSORE SANDALWOOD OIL is recognised as the World's Standard of Quality.
Ensure that you get only Original containers with the Mysore Government Seal and Label.
Place orders for supplies with the authorised Agents only or with the Factory.

GOVERNMENT SANDALWOOD OIL FACTORY, MYSORE.

THROUGH THE GATES OF GOLD

A FRAGMENT OF THOUGHT

By M. C.

"Secreted and hidden in the heart of the world and in the heart of man is the light which can illumine all life, the future and the past. Shall we not search for it?"

Price Rs. 2/- **Postage extra**

THEOSOPHY CO. (INDIA), PRIVATE, LTD.,
19, New Marine Lines, BOMBAY 1